

00048

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

SEWARD PENINSULA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

Hampton Inn

Anchorage, Alaska

March 17, 1998, 9:00 a.m.

VOLUME II

Members Present:

- Theodore Katcheak, Chairman
- Perry Mendenhall, Vice Chairman
- Grace Cross, Secretary
- Fred A.Katchatag, Sr.
- Peter G. Buck, Via-teleconference
- Johnson P. Eningowuk
- Cliff Edenshaw, Coordinator

00049

P R O C E E D I N G S

(On record - 9:00 a.m.)

VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: At this time I'd like to ask
Mr. Fred Katchatag for the invocation.

(Mr. Fred Katchatag gives invocation)

VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: At this roll call, please.

MS. CROSS: Grace Cross is here. Fred Katcheak?

VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Here.

MS. CROSS: Fred Katchatag, Sr.?

MR. KATCHATAG: Here.

MS. CROSS: Elmer Seetot, Jr.? I think he's there.
Trying to get him on line, right?

VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Yes.

MS. CROSS: Peter Buck?

MR. BUCK: Here.

MS. CROSS: Joe Garnie?

VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: He should be excused. He's
Iditaroding.

MS. CROSS: Perry Mendenhall?

MR. MENDENHALL: Here.

MS. CROSS: Johnson Eningowuk?

MR. ENINGOWUK: Here.

MS. CROSS: We have a quorum.

VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: At this time I'd like to open the
floor for election of officers. And the first one is for
Chair. I'd open the floor for nominations for Chair of the
Council.

MS. CROSS: I nominate Johnson Eningowuk.

00050

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I nominate Theodore Katcheak.

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion to close the
4 nominations.

5

6 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Motion by Perry to close the
7 nominations.

8

9 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

10

11 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Seconded by Fred. All in favor
12 say aye.

13

14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15

16 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Okay. We'll go ahead and how do
17 we do this? A ballot, secret ballot or a voice vote?

18

19 MR. KATCHATAG: I'd go for secret ballot.

20

21 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Secret ballot.

22

23 MS. CROSS: And then maybe you could check with him?

24

25 MR. EDENSHAW: Peter, did you hear that?

26

27 MR. BUCK: Yeah.

28

29 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Okay. We have a nomination for
30 Johnson Eningowuk and Ted Katcheak. We're holding a secret
31 ballot right now, Peter. We'll get to you in a moment, Peter.

32

33 MR. EDENSHAW: Peter?

34

35 MR. BUCK: Yeah.

36

37 MR. EDENSHAW: Cliff. The Council members have already
38 did a secret ballot and we'll just go ahead and ask you over
39 the phone for your vote.

40

41 MR. BUCK: I'll vote for Johnson.

42

43 MR. EDENSHAW: All right. Johnson Eningowuk has one
44 yes. This is Cliff again. The votes are in and it's a tie
45 vote. Johnson Eningowuk had three votes and Ted has three. Go
46 again.

47

48 MR. KATCHATAG: Where is Elmer Seetot?

49

50 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: He's off.

00051

1 MR. EDENSHAW: We couldn't get him on teleconference.

2
3 MS. CROSS: Do it again.

4
5 MR. EDENSHAW: Peter.

6
7 MR. BUCK: Yeah.

8
9 MR. EDENSHAW: This is Cliff again. We went ahead and
10 voted again and your vote is?

11
12 MR. BUCK: Still Johnson.

13
14 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay. The votes are in, it's a tie
15 again.

16
17 MR. KATCHATAG: I motion to table the action of
18 officers to the last issue this evening. Maybe Peter Buck will
19 change his mind.

20
21 MR. MENDENHALL: That's kind of improper because you
22 already have the action going on right now.

23
24 MR. KATCHATAG: Well, we can't sit here and tie all day
25 long.

26
27 MR. MENDENHALL: No, you can't, until you get a chair.
28 Because it's been improper to have a chair since October. We
29 already went through some meetings already. And there's a lot
30 of thing that are at stake with subsistence.

31
32 MR. ENINGOWUK: If it's proper then may I decline and
33 ask to seat Ted?

34
35 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Thank you, Johnson. And that be
36 that they're giving their vote of confidence and I'll be very
37 happy to serve as your Chair, if that's okay with the rest of
38 the Council.

39
40 MR. KATCHATAG: It's okay with me.

41
42 MR. EDENSHAW: Did you follow that, Peter?

43
44 MR. BUCK: I guess so.

45
46 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Johnson declined his nomination.
47 And he stated that he's new to this program and he would
48 decline as candidate for Chair. So is that all right with you,
49 Peter?

50

00052

1 MR. BUCK: I guess so. So Ted's the other nomination?

2
3 VICE CHAIR KATCHEAK: Yes.

4
5 MR. BUCK: Okay. I'll vote for Ted.

6
7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Peter. The next one is
8 vice-chair. I'll open the floor for nomination of vice-chair.

9
10 MR. KATCHATAG: I nominate Perry Mendenhall for vice-
11 president.

12
13 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any other nominations for vice-
14 chair?

15
16 MR. ENINGOWUK: I'll move to close nominations and ask
17 for unanimous consent.

18
19 MS. CROSS: Second.

20
21 MR. KATCHATAG: I second.

22
23 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Johnson moved to close nomination
24 and ask for unanimous consent. Seconded by Fred.
25 Congratulations, Perry.

26
27 MR. MENDENHALL: I'm very pleased.

28
29 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We'll open the floor for secretary.

30
31 MR. BUCK: This is Peter Buck and I nominate Grace
32 Cross.

33
34 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

35
36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Nomination for Grace for secretary
37 by Peter, seconded by Fred. All in favor of the nomination for
38 Grace signify by saying aye.

39
40 IN UNISON: Aye.

41
42 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Opposed. No.

43
44 MR. MENDENHALL: I moved for nominations to be closed
45 for secretary.

46
47 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Oh.

48
49 MR. KATCHATAG: Yeah.

50

00053

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: The nomination was to close
2 the.....

3
4 MR. KATCHATAG: Now we can say I.

5
6 MR. MENDENHALL: Or if this seat is still open.

7
8 MR. KATCHATAG: No, I moved that the nomination be
9 closed.

10
11 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes. I stand to be corrected.

12
13 MR. MENDENHALL: Now, you've got to have the vote
14 because he just closed it.

15
16 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay.

17
18 MR. MENDENHALL: To close it.

19
20 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Do I hear.....

21
22 MR. ENINGOWUK: I second the motion.

23
24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion was to close the nomination
25 and ask for unanimous consent for Grace by Fred, seconded by
26 Johnson. All in favor say aye.

27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29
30 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Congratulations, Grace.

31
32 MS. CROSS: Thank you.

33
34 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We have a revised agenda and I'd
35 like to read it now. We have the election of officers, which
36 we did. Have.....

37
38 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion to adopt the agenda
39 and leave it open until the end of this session because there
40 might be action to be taken on by Staff and other new
41 developments.

42
43 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Should I go ahead and read the
44 agenda?

45
46 MR. MENDENHALL: For review and adoption, that's got to
47 be a motion made at this time. So I move it be an opened
48 agenda.

49
50 MS. CROSS: I second the motion.

00054

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Perry's motioned to leave the
2 agenda open, seconded by Grace.

3
4 MR. MENDENHALL: And you can add the ones that you have
5 on now.

6
7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. We have one addition and
8 that's E, or Stebbins IRA Council Proposal. And Perry
9 Mendenhall, that is a recommendation on musk-oxen allocation.

10
11 MR. MENDENHALL: Ken Adkisson's musk-ox resolution.

12
13 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. Also Ken Adkisson's
14 recommendation or resolution on musk-oxen.

15
16 MR. MENDENHALL: Put that under F for proposals.

17
18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: F for Ken Adkisson's.....

19
20 MS. CROSS: Yeah, he's already there. He just handed
21 the proposals. And so he'll be addressing that and Bering Land
22 Bridge. He's already on the agenda.

23
24 MR. MENDENHALL: But it's a State proposal on musk-ox.
25 New proposal with six villages. It still has to be on the
26 proposals because it's going to go to the State Board.

27
28 MS. CROSS: Okay. Go ahead.

29
30 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So this is F for Ken Adkisson?

31
32 MR. MENDENHALL: That'd be F. That'd be under F
33 because it's a new proposal coming out of six villages.

34
35 MS. CROSS: Okay.

36
37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So note. Okay. Review and
38 adoption of the minutes. I'm sure most of you have read the
39 minutes of October 15 and 16.

40
41 MR. BUCK: Okay. This is Peter Buck.

42
43 MR. MENDENHALL: Now, we've got vote on the new agenda
44 as amended.

45
46 MR. BUCK: I was here for a conference and we haven't
47 been able to fly to White Mountain or to Nome or anything. So
48 I don't have the minutes or anything. Or I don't have any
49 material with me.

50

00055

1 MR. MENDENHALL: It was mailed to him.

2

3 MR. BUCK: So I'm just going to have to follow you
4 along some how.

5

6 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay.

7

8 MR. MENDENHALL: Take a vote on this as amended.

9

10 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. At this time I'd entertain a
11 motion to adopt the agenda or the minutes.....

12

13 MR. MENDENHALL: The agenda, as amended.

14

15 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Excuse me. The agenda as amended.

16

17 MR. MENDENHALL: So moved.

18

19 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

20

21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion by Perry Mendenhall to adopt
22 the minutes of the October 14, 15 and 16 meeting at Nome,
23 seconded by Fred.

24

25 MR. KATCHATAG: That motion is to accept the minutes of
26 March 17.

27

28 MS. CROSS: This one. We're on this one. Review and
29 adoption of this agenda.

30

31 MR. MENDENHALL: As amended.

32

33 MS. CROSS: As amended.

34

35 MR. KATCHATAG: You're talking about the agenda here?

36

37 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, the agenda. The amended agenda.
38 We just voted to fix the.....

39

40 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Correct. The motion was to adopt
41 the agenda as corrected by Fred and seconded by -- who was that
42 second?

43

44 MS. CROSS: Fred seconded, Perry made the motion.

45

46 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. Perry moved and Fred
47 seconded. All in favor say aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

00056

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We're down to adoption of the
2 minutes of October 14 to 16 that was held in Nome. If the
3 Council would go to Tab P. And since most of us have read it,
4 well let's take a minute.....

5
6 MS. CROSS: Mr. Chair, there's a correction on page one
7 under the first paragraph where all the present at the meeting
8 were. And there's Fred -- Fred's last name is misspelled.
9 It's supposed to be Tocktoo, it's T-a-k-t-o-o. So it's needs
10 to be changed T-o-c-k-t-o-o.

11
12 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion by Grace to make a
13 correction on Fred Tocktoo's last name to read T-o-c-k-t-o-o
14 instead of T-a-k-t-o-o. Okay. Next page, and the third page.

15
16 MR. MENDENHALL: No comments on two.

17
18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any comments on three? On four?
19 On page five? Page six? Page seven? Mr. Buck, do you have a
20 copy of our book or the blue book?

21
22 MR. BUCK: No, I don't have a copy of anything. I
23 expected to pick them up in White Mountain on the way to Nome
24 yesterday, but I'm still in Nome and I don't have any of this.

25
26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you.

27
28 MR. MENDENHALL: I'll make a motion to accept the
29 minutes of October 15-16 as corrected. And that was page one.

30
31 MS. CROSS: I second the motion.

32
33 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion by Perry to adopt the
34 minutes of October 15 and 16, seconded by Grace. All in favor
35 say aye.

36
37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38
39 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Those opposed no.

40
41 (No opposing responses)

42
43 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion is passed. We have the
44 floor open for public comments. I guess this is our standard
45 procedure. So we'll go down to the next item, Draft Proposal
46 Rule, following recommendation and Regional Council remarks and
47 recommendations.

48
49 MR. EDENSHAW: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. Maybe I should
50 have spoke up earlier, but I think in regard to perry

00057

1 Mendenhall's motion to leave the agenda open, when I prepared
2 this the other day, one of you called me the other day and we
3 spoke about the agenda. And the changes that I incorporated
4 into what you have in front of you are mainly the dates and
5 time has been changed at the top. And I conveyed with Ted and
6 the other Council members I think on Item number 7, the Draft
7 Proposed Rule, I believe that was Ted, Grace, Perry and.....

8
9 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Fred?

10
11 MR. EDENSHAW: No, not Fred. When were in Unalakleet
12 there were you three and there was an information on the
13 fisheries. Now, what I wanted to convey to the Council this
14 morning is that in lieu of number 6, we can come back -- it's
15 just totally up to you. But what what we wanted to go ahead
16 with was proposals. And that's under Tab Q.

17
18 MR. KATCHATAG: P?

19
20 MR. EDENSHAW: Q as in quiet, Fred. But when I was
21 talking with Ted this morning and Perry and the others, and
22 with us this morning we have the other individuals who will
23 present those. (Indiscernible) is the biologist and Helen
24 Armstrong, the archaeologist on the proposal we have under that
25 tab.

26
27 And at the last meeting in Unalakleet we were going to
28 address, if you look in your blue books, under the Federal
29 Subsistence Program Update, some of that information was
30 conveyed in Unalakleet when we were up there that specifically
31 we wanted to address the (indiscernible) standing in the
32 Federal Subsistence Program. And that goes back to about a
33 year ago there was a proposal that was submitted regarding
34 moose in 22(A). So I think in terms of the priority we wanted
35 to address proposals this morning and specifically that item
36 there regarding family and then after that it would be -- also
37 I think the Regional Council charters. Those are renewed every
38 two years, even numbered years. And there was some language
39 that was brought up at the last Regional Council meeting in
40 Nome, prior to the one in Unalakleet. So I just wanted to add
41 those comments in there. And if you'll look at your agenda
42 that was in your booklet and the one that I copied out, some of
43 the information was identical, with the exception of the
44 heading on those and item number 12.

45
46 MR. MENDENHALL: By agenda corrections we already had F
47 for musk-ox from Ken because of the six village action that
48 they had. So that's a regular proposal, so that it go before
49 the State Board.

50

00058

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Is that proposal going to be a
2 recommendation because.....

3
4 MR. MENDENHALL: I mean it's still a proposal
5 because.....

6
7 MR. EDENSHAW: Because what we're going to address on
8 the proposal is under Tab Q, are proposals that the Regional
9 Council had presented to them when Peter Bente and the Council,
10 when we met in Nome. Those are the proposals and these are the
11 analysis as a result of those proposals in Nome.

12
13 MR. MENDENHALL: So are you saying that's under eight
14 or seven? That's what I'm getting at.

15
16 MR. EDENSHAW: Eight.

17
18 MR. MENDENHALL: Eight. So they're analysis.

19
20 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So are we still on seven?

21
22 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, we were on seven. Yeah.

23
24 MR. EDENSHAW: No. And I was just clarifying some
25 information to the Council from.....

26
27 MS. CROSS: Resolutions.

28
29 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, but we've still got to go
30 through this analysis.

31
32 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Should we go ahead and proceed with
33 that Draft Proposed Rule?

34
35 MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, Taylor Brelsford. Maybe
36 I can help with this. Item number 7 refers to the fisheries
37 Proposed Rule. And we had a fairly extensive discussion in
38 Unalakleet with a set of Council members. And also in a public
39 hearing in Unalakleet that Tuesday evening. So I would say we
40 don't want to repeat the presentation today, and instead just
41 take a minute and if you have comments or reactions from what
42 you read or what you heard at those discussions in Unalakleet,
43 this would be a moment to just make some comments or reactions
44 on the part of the Council. And if there are no further
45 comments in the meeting, we could move right on to the
46 priority, which would be these proposals from the fall, and now
47 a new proposal regarding musk-ox that several of you have
48 mentioned.

49
50 So item number 7, if you want to take it up, we'd do it

00059

1 kind of quickly and then move on to the proposals under item
2 number 8. I hope that clarifies the purpose of the agenda
3 items, Mr. Chair.

4

5 MS. CROSS: Mr. Chair, may I ask a question, please?

6

7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question.

8

9 MS. CROSS: There's two -- Johnson and Fred were not at
10 the meeting. Do you want a short summary of what happened on
11 item number 7?

12

13 MR. ENINGOWUK: Very quickly would be helpful.

14

15 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Could you state your name when
16 you.....

17

18 MR. MENDENHALL: No, not.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All right. Any remarks?

21

22 MR. MENDENHALL: For those that were absent.

23

24 MS. CROSS: Excuse me, and Peter Buck was not there
25 either. I'm sorry, I forgot you, Peter. Right now you're just
26 like a satellite.

27

28 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any remarks from the Council?

29

30 MR. BUCK: This is Peter Buck again. With the adoption
31 of the agenda, I'd like to know was a quorum established in
32 Unalakleet? And I'd like to know the circumstances of how
33 Sheldon got -- resigned from the reappointment to the Federal
34 Subsistence Board.

35

36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: To my understanding, Peter, this is
37 Ted, Sheldon stated that he didn't want to serve in the
38 Regional Council anymore. So he sent his resignation by fax to
39 us stating his reasons why he didn't want to continue on as our
40 Federal Subsistence Council member for Seward Peninsula.

41

42 MS. CROSS: We didn't have a quorum.

43

44 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: And we did not have a quorum.
45 There was only three of us. It was an informal meeting and we
46 were just hearing the Staff gave us some reports. And that's
47 all we did. There was no business done during the meeting.

48

49 MR. BUCK: Okay. But the information that Sheldon
50 sent, you know, his resignation information, that should have

00060

1 been passed to the Board members too so we can know what's
2 going on.

3
4 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Cliff.

5
6 MR. EDENSHAW: Peter, this is Cliff speaking. Sheldon
7 called me yesterday and I received the original letter of
8 resignation from him. And he asked that I fax -- well,
9 normally, the process we handle when a Regional Council member
10 resigns, is that we have nominations that are coming up here.
11 The nominations close March 20th. So and one avenue that's the
12 procedure that we follow and his seat will be filled during the
13 regular process of nominations.

14
15 Secondly, and I apologize, he asked that I -- when we
16 were in Unalakleet I read into the record after receiving the
17 fax later in Unalakleet from him from Elim. I read portions of
18 the letter into the record. I have a copy in my office and
19 when we convene for lunch I'll go ahead and make copies of that
20 and I'll bring that back here to the meeting room and I'll fax
21 a copy of that or mail that to you up to White Mountain, Peter.

22
23 MR. BUCK: Okay. That sounds good.

24
25 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any other Council remarks? Mr.
26 Perry Mendenhall.

27
28 MR. MENDENHALL: We'll let them finish their briefing
29 to these people, what took place.

30
31 MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, there's a very brief
32 summary sheet that we used last time. I'll talk basically from
33 this. I've provided copies of these proposed regulations for
34 Fred and for Johnson. But I want to be very brief right now
35 and maybe talk afterwards at greater length with the other
36 Council members so that we can keep our focus on the
37 priorities.

38
39 So the general picture here about the Katie John
40 regulations is that the.....

41
42 MR. HAYNES: Pardon me, Taylor, could you turn that
43 mike around, please.

44
45 MR. BRELSFORD: Sure. The big picture is that the
46 court made its decision in the Katie John case and it told the
47 Federal government to expand into certain Federal waters,
48 waters inside of conservation units like parks or refuges. So
49 the court made its final decision in December of 1995.
50 Actually it's back quite a while. There is kind of a tug-of-

00061

1 war with the Congress because Congress said don't go ahead on
2 this, wait for the State of Alaska to reunify, to bring back a
3 solution on subsistence.

4
5 So Congress passed what's called a moratorium. And up
6 until December of 1998, even though the court said get going,
7 the Congress said, hold fast, you can't go ahead to the Final
8 Rule until after December of 1998. So that's like the
9 guidelines here. In the meantime we're doing some of the
10 preparation steps so that we would have good public
11 understanding and be ready if we have to go ahead after
12 December 1998.

13
14 MR. KATCHATAG: When you said conservation units, who
15 do you mean?

16
17 MR. BRELSFORD: The word conservation units in this
18 jurisdiction question refers to parks, national wildlife
19 refuges, national forests, some special lands under
20 jurisdiction of the BLM, like the National Petroleum Reserve on
21 the Arctic Slope. They are lands that are set aside for
22 Federal governments for conservation purposes on into the
23 future.

24
25 In the Seward Peninsula area, you guys probably have a
26 good visual picture of this, there are very limited Federal
27 lands in the Seward Peninsula area and, therefore, only a few
28 rivers are actually affected by the Katie John decision. Those
29 lands would be primarily up in the northern part of the Seward
30 Peninsula in the Bering Land Bridge Monument or National
31 Preserve, excuse me, or down in the south of the Seward
32 Peninsula, those pink lands over there would be the Yukon-Delta
33 National Wildlife Refuge, those would be examples of Federal
34 conservation units and the waters inside of those conservation
35 units would come under the Katie John decision.

36
37 BLM lands, like the brown lands kind of on the eastern
38 portion of the Seward Peninsula are not a permanent
39 conservation unit and so those lands -- waters in the BLM lands
40 are generally not affected by the Katie John decision. I'll
41 mention one other special case in your area. The Unalakleet
42 River is a wild and scenic river in its upper portions and as a
43 consequence it is covered by the Katie John decision. So
44 that's kind of focusing on which waters would be affected on
45 this.

46
47 So there are certain planning steps being taken right
48 now. You might remember some public meetings in April/May/June
49 of 1996. There was a very big meeting in Nome, lots of people
50 attended. That was called and Advance Notice of Proposed Rule

00062

1 Making. It talked mostly about which waters would be affected.
2 But now the regulations before you to look through are called
3 the Proposed Regulations or the Proposed Rule.

4
5 MR. KATCHATAG: You're on number 8 on our agenda,
6 right?

7
8 MR. BRELSFORD: No, number 7.

9
10 MR. KATCHATAG: Oh, okay.

11
12 MR. BRELSFORD: And it goes into very great detail
13 about which waters would be affected by the Katie John
14 decision. And if you'll move towards the back you'll see c&t
15 determinations about fish, like we've worked quite a lot on c&t
16 determinations for wildlife. Now, there's some more looking at
17 fisheries. And then in the last part you'll see seasonal
18 openings and bag limits, all of the like on the ground
19 regulations regarding subsistence fisheries.

20
21 Let me just mention that if you want to take a look
22 through this at some point maybe later, you'll find that there
23 are some little notations here on the sides here to draw your
24 attention to any significant changes or additions. It says new
25 or modified text. So that's kind of a road map to where the
26 important changes are.

27
28 MR. KATCHATAG: Are these changes under the moratorium
29 season that Congress is waiting for?

30
31 MR. BRELSFORD: Yes.

32
33 MR. KATCHATAG: Okay.

34
35 MR. BRELSFORD: So this is like only a draft.

36
37 MR. KATCHATAG: Okay.

38
39 MR. BRELSFORD: It doesn't go into effect out on the
40 fishing grounds until after that moratorium is lifted. And,
41 actually, there's another step called a final rule. There are
42 some more steps before it would become a valid regulatory
43 program. But right now we're still in the planning phase.

44
45 MR. KATCHATAG: Will this moratorium be lifted by
46 September?

47
48 MR. BRELSFORD: The moratorium right now extends
49 through December of 1998.

50

00063

1 MR. KATCHATAG: Oh, okay.

2

3 MR. BRELSFORD: And, again, the purpose of that was to
4 allow the State Legislature to consider some resolution of the
5 subsistence problem. So all of us want to watch and see what
6 happens in the State Legislature first and then we'll kind of
7 see what goes on through the summer and all the way up to
8 December.

9

10 If the State resolution works, then probably the
11 Federal fisheries business would just come to an end with no
12 further action. If the State resolution does not work out, if
13 the Governor's Task Force or all of these proposals break down
14 somewhere, then probably what would happen is the Federal
15 government would have to go ahead as the court ordered. The
16 moratorium would expire in December and we might actually go
17 forward.

18

19 Well, that's kind of the background, what brought these
20 proposed regulations before you and kind of some milestones,
21 legislative action in December of 1998. Rather than go through
22 a lot of the content here, I'd maybe rather leave that to you.
23 There's a summary in this cover sheet, just four or five.....

24

25 MR. KATCHATAG: In September you'll know more about it
26 anyway when we're meeting in Nome.

27

28 MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

29

30 MR. KATCHATAG: We can table everything until then.

31

32 MR. BRELSFORD: The last thing I wanted to say was that
33 these regulations are opened for public comment. There's
34 meetings around 31 places in Alaska right around now.

35

36 MR. KATCHATAG: Between now and December, right?

37

38 MR. BRELSFORD: About April 20th, actually. So the
39 public comment period on these regulations is opened through
40 April 20th. And if you wanted to read them and have some ideas
41 to submit, to call us up with or to send down, in the front
42 part it actually explains how to submit public comments through
43 April 20th. So that was what I thought might work as just a
44 quick thumbnail summary of the purpose of this agenda item and
45 the material that's before you. With that I'll quit and see if
46 there are any quick questions and can move on, Mr. Chairman.

47

48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Taylor. Any questions.

49

50 MR. MENDENHALL: Right. We just had a Fish Board

00064

1 meeting in Nome regarding the subsistence on March 3rd, 4th and
2 5th, in which time they made substantial changes on
3 subsistence. I don't know how that would be reflected in this
4 new proposed regulation because you've got Point Clarence and
5 all that, a blurb like this, when they just up the take from
6 86,000 to 96,000 to 160,000 salmon now for subsistence use,
7 which was never done before. And they're looking into Tier II
8 process for the Nome area alone. That's not reflected in these
9 and I don't know how that would be showing up coming December
10 '98 on their action because the recommended changes will come
11 forth in February, will solidify by October, but come forth
12 then again in March of '99.

13
14 MR. BRELSFORD: It's actually a very important point,
15 Perry. And several people in public meetings have said, you
16 guys were trying to incorporate State subsistence regulations,
17 but now they've changed, what you have here is out of date in
18 many regions.

19
20 MR. MENDENHALL: And I participated quite heavily on
21 that process on the State level. And I wondered how that would
22 be reflective on this -- to what the State is going to adopt in
23 October, because they're going through still selection criteria
24 for Nome subsistence users. And they will affect Area M as
25 well. Because what they added to Nome, it's going to take away
26 from another area, either Unalakleet or Yukon or Area M.
27 That's in the works.

28
29 MR. BRELSFORD: Right. The way I would see it is that
30 we're getting a lot of public input right now, including
31 comments about these updates or revisions, changes in the State
32 subsistence regulations. Those are going to be evaluated after
33 the public comment period and some adjustments made, some
34 revisions. Again, the Proposed Rule comes out first for public
35 comment, then those public comments are evaluated and some
36 changes incorporated, and then a Final Rule is issued
37 afterwards.

38
39 So I think the revisions on State regulations and other
40 public comments, other changes requested by the public, are
41 going to be considered in moving from this Proposed Rule out to
42 the Final Rule that would actually become the regulations on
43 the ground. So we're in a draft stage of rule making.

44
45 MR. MENDENHALL: The State is in a draft stage too, the
46 Tier II process for Nome.

47
48 MR. BRELSFORD: Right. Some changes have been made,
49 some are still underway in the process. What we would be
50 trying to do is to incorporate, based on the public input,

00065

1 based on reactions to the Proposed regulation, try and come out
2 with a Final Rule that is current and accurate and appropriate.
3 So those changes by the State would be evaluated as part of
4 moving from the Proposed Rule to the Final Rule.

5

6 MR. MENDENHALL: And to make it constitutionally
7 strong, they are including all users within the Nome area, all
8 groups. That needs to be noted. This is the first time the
9 State is having a process of that magnitude.

10

11 MR. BRELSFORD: Helen is bring me back to concrete
12 examples. I was thinking in general, because we've heard a lot
13 about new State changes. But thinking specifically about the
14 Seward-Pen area, there are not any Federal waters affected by
15 the Katie John decision in the Nome area. If you look at the
16 northern part of Norton Bay and Norton Sound, those don't have
17 any waters affected. So a lot of those precise changes by the
18 State program would not actually come into the Federal program
19 because they're not on the waters.

20

21 MR. MENDENHALL: But, if you.....

22

23 MS. CROSS: Excuse me. I think what he meant was that
24 it's not the Nome area that's going to change. He was just
25 alerting you that other parts of the Yukon-Kuskokwim, they're
26 going to be affected by what's happening.

27

28 MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

29

30 MS. CROSS: But we don't know what those proposed
31 changes are going to be and at what point in time is this
32 Council going to be addresses the changes that are going
33 to.....

34

35 MR. MENDENHALL: They're going to take away from Yukon,
36 they're going to take away from Unalakleet, and they're going
37 to take away from somewhere else.

38

39 MS. CROSS:in order to get the fish back.....

40

41 MR. MENDENHALL: That's what I'm pointing to, that
42 fishing regulations. When they take so much fish and give a
43 number to another allocation, then they have to take away from
44 other allocations from other parts of Alaska, commercial
45 subsistence.

46

47 MR. BRELSFORD: Well, let's see if Tom has a more
48 focused approach on this.

49

50 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Mr. Boyd?

00066

1 MR. MENDENHALL: And I'm just reflecting on this
2 because it does mention salmon.

3
4 MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

5
6 MR. MENDENHALL: That's why I'm bringing it out.

7
8 MS. CROSS: My question would be, at what point in time
9 are we going to be able to look at what's happening within the
10 Feds as they address the other areas which will affect our
11 area? At what point are we going to be looking at the changes
12 in regulations that the State is imposing that you would need
13 to be consistent with, hopefully, or not be consistent with?
14 At what point in time are we going to be looking at proposed
15 regulations that will reflect what's happening in Seward
16 Peninsula?

17
18 MR. BOYD: I'm trying to understand the context of the
19 question itself and I think I understand it. Well, as Taylor
20 has mentioned, it's sort of a reconciliation or a bringing
21 together of the existing or current State regulations with the
22 Final Rule as best we can at that point in time. And that
23 would be when we publish the Final Rule, and that would be
24 sometime after December 1, 1998. But I'm not sure I understand
25 completely your question.

26
27 MS. CROSS: Okay. What's happening in Nome area, is we
28 have gone Tier II, which is not Federal land.

29
30 MR. BOYD: Right.

31
32 MS. CROSS: So what's going to happen is that the State
33 is going to be looking at the Federal lands and the State lands
34 that is outside of Nome jurisdiction and making adjustments as
35 to how their fishing is going to be regulated, which includes
36 Federal lands. So I was asking at what point in time are you
37 going to be taking your regulations and making appropriate
38 changes, and at what point in time are we going to be looking
39 at those proposed changes? This is inevitable, it's coming.

40
41 MR. BOYD: I think what we're going to be doing over
42 the next several months is staying current with or staying
43 abreast of the changes that are occurring with the State
44 regulations. And it may be that we need to adopt those
45 regulations as they change. You know the timing of this is
46 critical, but as the State changes its regulations, if that
47 timing coincides with our regulatory process, it may be
48 possible that we bring those changes into our Final Rule
49 making.

50

00067

1 But it's not -- I'm a little bit at a loss on your
2 question, but that's how I would envision it. It may be that
3 we could bring those changes back to you in the fall Council
4 meeting if we're aware that there are these changes going on at
5 that time. I mean if the State has made those changes in their
6 regulations at that time, we may bring those back to you to see
7 if those are changes that you would like to see in the Federal
8 Rule.

9
10 MR. MENDENHALL: I have no problem with that. That's
11 the only comments I have there. And I noted that there was
12 other regulation changes based on our October meeting.

13
14 MR. BOYD: But going back to another point you raised
15 about allocations. These regulations do not address
16 allocations. Those are generally a function of management
17 plans and the parameters and escapement goals and other goals
18 for subsistence uses and objective that are put in the
19 management planning process.

20
21 MR. MENDENHALL: Because under the State they ask us
22 for allo -- that we have proposals for allocation.

23
24 MR. BOYD: And I think what we would be doing under a
25 Federal Subsistence Fishery Program is first looking at what
26 the management plan -- the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's
27 Management Plan say with regard to allocations. Our Board may
28 or may not agree with those allocations. And we may want to,
29 you know, further negotiate, if you will, with the State to
30 come up with better numbers of different numbers to meet the
31 Federal mandate of delivering subsistence fish to fisheries
32 that occur in Federal waters, if that makes sense.

33
34 MR. MENDENHALL: That sort of makes sense. But I think
35 we'll see further development along that line. That would fit
36 in with your proposed change here. All I'm doing is just red-
37 flagging. I'm not making an issue of it. I just want it to be
38 alerted to and that we need to watch it and see how they
39 develop it. Because this is the first time, I think, the rural
40 Alaska had friendly users on the State Fishing Board towards
41 subsistence.

42
43 MR. KATCHATAG: May I say something?

44
45 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Mr. Katchatag.

46
47 MR. KATCHATAG: You need to look at the spawning
48 service. It seems to me that all over the northern part of
49 Alaska where beaver are moving in, they're closing off all the
50 spawning sloughs for the fish to spawn on. And it seems to me

00068

1 like since this happening -- it's been happening for the last
2 20 years, and all the fish ever since that time, when we caught
3 fish, we caught fish in fall time after they spawn. That's the
4 best time to dry fish. And then we notice that some of the
5 fish that we cut are not edible. There's something going on in
6 the water that's taking away the strength of the fish, like
7 they get old real fast. Sometimes you see a real old fish even
8 in June. And that just never used to be like that. And we
9 kind of think that it's the beaver that's killing off the
10 species of the fish by blocking off their spawning sloughs up
11 the river. There's a lot of beaver, you know.

12

13 MR. BOYD: We're hearing that all over the State, or in
14 many places in the State, that this is an issue.

15

16 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I have a question. How do we
17 address this problem of beaver? We have a lot of beaver south
18 of Stebbins on your drainages. And not very many people trap
19 the beavers anymore and they keep increasing and we see that
20 all over the coast, I think, like Fred mentioned.

21

22 MR. MENDENHALL: In our proposals we have to....

23

24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay.

25

26 MR. MENDENHALL: And then the State's got -- that's
27 what they're going to bring up before the State Board. That's
28 why we have changed that on the beaver thing in the proposals.

29

30 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any other recommendation from the
31 Council on.....

32

33 MR. MENDENHALL: That's the only reason I brought that
34 comment about subsistence, because it's not reflected in here.
35 And they already said that they will alert us.

36

37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Do you have anything else to add,
38 Mr. Boyd?

39

40 MR. BOYD: I guess just to reflect back to you. What
41 I'm hearing is that there is ongoing deliberations and changes,
42 potential changes to the State's subsistence fishing
43 regulations and allocations in the Seward Peninsula region.

44

45 MR. MENDENHALL: Affected from Bristol Bay into the
46 northwest area.

47

48 MR. BOYD: And this has implications for other areas of
49 the State to change theirs. And what you're alerting us to is
50 to keep abreast of this situation, if there are concrete

00069

1 changes to the State regulations that we need to track and
2 possibly bring back and be reflected in our regulations. We
3 should bring those back to you in the fall to get your input on
4 them.

5

6 MS. CROSS: And then your comment period may be
7 extended. Who knows.

8

9 MR. BOYD: Yeah. Who knows? I think that's a good
10 point.

11

12 MR. MENDENHALL: We don't know how it's going to end up
13 either. It's a new process, totally brand new, that they're
14 trying out because this is the first time Tier II has been
15 stressed before the State.

16

17 MS. CROSS: Our concern is because the majority of us
18 are subsistence users in the region that is not governed by the
19 Feds and we're going to be directly affected. And the rivers
20 that are going to be affected by this are under your
21 jurisdiction. Well, thank you for listening.

22

23 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Mr. Brelsford and Mr.
24 Boyd. Let's go on down to proposals. I'll turn the floor over
25 to -- what is your name, ma'am?

26

27 MR. DEWHURST: Donna Dewhurst.

28

29 MS. CROSS: Can we take a five minute break.

30

31 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Before we go to Donna, could we
32 take a five minute recess. Peter, are you still there?

33

34 MR. BUCK: Yes, I'm still here.

35

36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We're taking a five minute break
37 here.

38

39 MR. BUCK: Okay.

40

41 (Off record)

42

43 (On record)

44

45 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Back to order. And Donna.

46

47 MS. DEWHURST: We're on Proposal 85 is the first one.
48 It's under Tab Q and it's listed as page seven. The page
49 numbers are a little funky, though, but it's listed as page
50 seven. It's the beginning of the analyses. Tab Q, page seven.

00070

1 Most of these proposals are fairly straightforward. So I don't
2 anticipate a lot of problems with any of them. Several of them
3 were, as you recall from the fall meeting, suggested by Peter
4 Bente, is aligning Federal and State regulations. And then you
5 as a Council then agreed with that and put forward as a
6 proposal.

7
8 This was one of those that the State has already
9 approved and we're talking about aligning Federal with State
10 regulations. This is the Northwest Alaska brown bear
11 management area, which already includes the area north of
12 Kotzebue, some of those regions, and this would be adding the
13 Seward Peninsula to it. Now, the State has already done it.
14 So this would be aligning the Federal with the State.

15
16 What it involves primarily, you know, getting down to
17 the nitty-gritty, some of the things that would change for a
18 bear hunter on the Seward Peninsula if we approve this for
19 Federal lands, is they would be allowed to take a bear every
20 regulatory year versus every four years. Now, that's already
21 in effect for 22(A) and (B), I believe, but not for (D) and
22 (E), not for the western area. So that would be one change.
23 People in 22(D) and (E) would now be allowed to take a bear
24 every year versus every four years.

25
26 Sealing requirements would not be required any more.
27 You wouldn't have to seal your bear unless you're taking the
28 hide out of the management area. Like you're taking it off the
29 Seward Peninsula. And if you take the hide out of the
30 management area you have to destroy the trophy value, which
31 usually isn't a hardship to subsistence folks. Meaning you
32 have to remove the front claws and the skin of the head have to
33 be removed. So it can't be made into a nice little mount to be
34 put on the wall. And, like I say, most subsistence users
35 aren't interested in that anyway and if you use the hide it's
36 not a big deal because you're using it for making clothing.

37
38 Aircraft, and this is one of the big things, is
39 aircraft cannot be used for bear hunting in the management
40 area. Now, it doesn't prohibit normal air taxi operations
41 between villages. That's still perfectly allowed. What it
42 does prohibit is some guy to fly out to a remote site and hunt
43 a bear. You know, you can't use aircraft to access remote
44 sites. So that is a big thing. That's the gist of it, that's
45 the gist of the changes that would be involved if we adopt
46 putting Seward Peninsula in the Northwest Alaska brown bear
47 management area. And like I say, the State's already approved
48 this, so this is just a matter of if we want to follow suit.

49
50 Oh, there's one other thing. Right now there's a split

00071

1 season. There's a fall season, September 1 to October 31st and
2 a spring season, April 15th to May 25. That would change so it
3 would be one big season, basically, September 1 to May 31st.
4 So that would be one other change. So instead of a fall and a
5 spring season, which is the standard sport hunting seasons
6 across the State, you'd have one big season that would go from
7 the beginning of September to the end of May.

8
9 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Donna, I have a proposal from
10 Stebbins IRA Council to change those dates of when it should be
11 opened and when it should be closed. And this was March 5,
12 Stebbins IRA Council meeting. They proposed that they would
13 like to see the bear season opened from April 1 to May 31st,
14 and close again, open July 1st to October 31st. This was
15 proposed by the Stebbins IRA Council.

16
17 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah. Under this proposal I'm thinking
18 that would have to be a separate proposal in the next
19 regulatory year, unless they wanted it to be a special action.
20 But I don't think it would fall under our special action
21 category, i.e., there isn't an environmental reason, there
22 isn't weather-related or some other extenuating circumstances.
23 But I'm guessing that that would have to be a new proposal for
24 next year. This proposal is only dealing with adding the
25 Northwest brown bear area under the current guidelines, which
26 would include their April 1st to May 31st. It would include
27 that aspect of it already, but it wouldn't include that July 1
28 to October 31st. That would be outside this. And I don't
29 think you as a Council could just change the dates because
30 these dates go with the brown bear area for the whole area. So
31 that would be a special proposal for their area that would be
32 separate from this one, that my feeling is that that would need
33 to be made from their IRA in the next proposal cycle and submit
34 it in September and put it into the next proposal cycle. I
35 don't think you could modify this one enough to meet theirs.

36
37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All right.

38
39 MR. DEWHURST: Because this is just saying that Seward-
40 Pen would go under this big umbrella of this Northwest brown
41 bear area, which includes a lot of other areas. And as far as
42 I know, they aren't piecemeal about dates, they want the dates
43 to be the same throughout the whole brown bear area.

44
45 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Perry.

46
47 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion to accept the
48 recommendations on this proposal.

49
50 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion by Perry to accept the

00072

1 Proposal 85 and recommended changes.

2

3 MS. DEWHURST: Just to clarify now, the recommendations
4 which are back on page 11, there were two recommended changes
5 or amendments which are real slight. One of them was to add
6 Nome as the sealing point, which that's not a big deal, Nome is
7 a place where you could seal your bears if you wanted to take
8 them out of the area. Currently it's not listed. And the
9 other one, and this was suggested by the State, was that if the
10 bear hide is going to be presented for commercial tanning,
11 which would include the Shishmaref Tannery, that the skin of
12 the skull -- the trophy value would have to be destroyed. If
13 somebody wanted to get their bear tanned in Shishmaref, they'd
14 have to destroy the trophy value, meaning taking the front
15 claws off and the head of the skull -- or the skin of the
16 skull, I'm sorry, which is the way the State regulations do
17 read right now. So I just wanted to make you aware of that,
18 that if you accept that you're accepting those two
19 modifications.

20

21 MR. MENDENHALL: To start, that's all we're looking at.

22

23 MS. DEWHURST: Right.

24

25 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: A question, Donna. At some time
26 this last year one of the elders told me there was a relocation
27 of brown bear from Kodiak to Anvik area some time back in the
28 1950s, either the mid-50s or the late-50s. Does anybody know
29 the history of that or any.....

30

31 MS. DEWHURST: I used to work in that area, not on
32 Kodiak specifically, but I worked on the Alaska Peninsula for
33 eight years and I never heard that, I never heard of anybody
34 talking about that, but it certainly. But I never heard it.
35 So I don't have any knowledge on it.

36

37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I talked to my wife also. Sometime
38 back in Holy Cross they became aware of there was a relocation
39 of brown bears from Kodiak because they were nuisance bears,
40 transported over to Anvik area.

41

42 MS. DEWHURST: And it's quite possible back in the 50s
43 and the 60s that was the thought, was just to relocate the
44 bears when they became a nuisance in town. Since then, because
45 of the high cost of doing that, most places don't do that any
46 more, they just shoot them if they're a problem in a town. But
47 that's quite possible. From what I've read back in the 50s and
48 the 60s, that was more the thought, was to relocate them. And
49 they had to relocate them a long way away so they couldn't get
50 back. But for Kodiak I don't know if it would be a factor

00073

1 since it's an island; they'd have to swim back to the island if
2 you got them off the island.

3

4 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Is there a way for Donna could
5 research that and find out what the story is behind that?

6

7 MS. DEWHURST: I could check into it. Sure.

8

9 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Be interesting to know because we
10 have grizzly bear and brown bear in our coast. So I'm thinking
11 that was the result on that.

12

13 MS. DEWHURST: Well, the Kodiak brown bear it's a
14 different sub-species. It's the coastal brown bear which is
15 larger than the interior species. So that would be very
16 interesting to know if some of those larger bears were
17 introduced to the Seward Peninsula area.

18

19 MR. MENDENHALL: There's a lot of 600 pounds bears.

20

21 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, the Kodiakers you get -- you know,
22 the length are nine footers, you know, I mean nine-nine and a
23 half footers. They're big bears.

24

25 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Occasionally we see those big brown
26 bears.

27

28 MS. DEWHURST: I mean it's possible. I don't put
29 anything past, you know, what could have been done back then.
30 Like I say, that was something they liked to do back then and
31 then they realized the cost was so ridiculous that nowadays if
32 a bear is a problem in a town they shoot it and don't try to
33 relocate it.

34

35 MS. CROSS: Mr. Chair, point of order. There's a
36 motion on the floor.

37

38 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes.

39

40 MS. CROSS: I second the motion.

41

42 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion is made by Perry and
43 seconded by Grace to adopt Proposal 85 with changes.

44

45 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Discussion or.....

46

47 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

48

49 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: That was seconded by Grace.

50

00074

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Discussion?

2
3 MR. MENDENHALL: Question.

4
5 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question called. All in favor say
6 aye.

7
8 IN UNISON: Aye.

9
10 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Those opposed no.

11
12 (No opposing responses)

13
14 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you. You're back, Peter.

15
16 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chairman?

17
18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes.

19
20 MR. EDENSHAW: May I make a comment? In regards to the
21 proposal review procedure, and on the agenda under Item number
22 7 in introduction of proposal, that's moot. Whether it's Helen
23 or Donna, that's fine. And then the biological/sociocultural
24 analysis, either one of those two will do that. When we met
25 last time in Unalakleet, there was someone there from ADF&G who
26 would address the proposals. Because what we have in front of
27 us is that the Councils first look at the proposals, after the
28 Staff wrote them up. So they had been there to give their
29 comments, Jim Magdanz or Susan Georgette or Peter Bente would
30 have been there to give their comments on the proposals.

31
32 And then Item D, it's just summary of written comments.
33 Those are the comments that we receive in our office from
34 individuals in the region. And then seeing as we're meeting
35 here in Anchorage I don't see anyone here from outside the
36 region who is here to provide any comment on the proposal. And
37 I just want to clarify on Proposal 85, this proposal and the
38 remaining four are a result of input from Peter Bente with
39 ADF&G and the Regional Council in Nome last year made motions
40 and as a result these are the proposals.

41
42 So the Council may make modifications if they'd like.
43 I was looking at Proposal 85 as Donna went through it. They
44 were modifying the season, as well as inclusion of 22 in the
45 Northwest brown bear management area. So it is -- you know, if
46 the Council wishes they may do so, make changes or
47 recommendations in the initial proposal that is here. Those
48 changes would be reflected. Once the meeting has adjourned we
49 would go back to our office and we'd make those changes and
50 they would be addressed not only by Staff Committee, by ADF&G

00075

1 again. And once the Board meets in May, that's when they would
2 be thumbs up or down in terms of approval. So I just have to
3 say that if the Council sees fit that they want to make changes
4 or modifications to a proposal, they may do so.

5

6 MR. MENDENHALL: I thought that these were action
7 items. Basically because they are proposals, they're action
8 items.

9

10 MR. EDENSHAW: Correct.

11

12 MR. MENDENHALL: And the reason we never took any
13 action on them is because we didn't have a quorum at
14 Unalakleet.

15

16 MR. EDENSHAW: No, I understand that. I was just
17 clarifying the point when Donna came up here initially and
18 regards to the Chair's resolution from Stebbins IRA requesting
19 a change in the season, that the Council may have done so.

20

21 MR. MENDENHALL: At that time in October?

22

23 MR. EDENSHAW: No. The motion you just passed to
24 accept the proposal analysis as is.

25

26 MR. MENDENHALL: We did make motion, but we wanted an
27 analysis to back up some of their.....

28

29 MS. ARMSTRONG: Let me say this. I think you can make
30 motions to modify proposals if they're not totally outside the
31 range. Because, see, the proposals have already gone to the
32 public and then they have an analysis done to them. So if they
33 made a change that was really significant with a season in the
34 summer, they wouldn't have any analysis to support that. And I
35 think that's why Donna was saying that.

36

37 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay.

38

39 MS. ARMSTRONG: That something major like a major
40 season change you would want it to be in the proposal process,
41 coming in the fall, going out to the public for their comment,
42 getting an analysis and then going to the Council in the winter
43 meeting. And I think that's what Donna was saying. That's
44 something where it's a change of about a week or two or a
45 month, but it wasn't going through an entirely different
46 season. Am I correct in what you were saying, Donna, that
47 that's what you were implying?

48

49 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah. It's also the fact that that
50 proposal was to adopt the brown bear management area as a

00076

1 package.

2

3 MS. ARMSTRONG: Right.

4

5 MS. DEWHURST: So that would be outside that package.

6

7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Helen Armstrong, you can take the
8 floor.

9

10 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to be
11 providing the analysis for the Request for Reconsideration that
12 appears in your book right after the proposal we just reviewed.
13 It's under Tab Q and it appears on page 14 is where it starts.
14 There is an executive summary.

15

16 This is not a proposal but a Request for
17 Reconsideration to reconsider a proposal from last year. This
18 came before this Council at this time last year, went before
19 the Federal Subsistence Board and was adopted, and now the
20 State has come back saying they don't agree with the Board's
21 decision. The original proposal that was adopted by the Board
22 was to give Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay and Chevak positive
23 customary and traditional use determination for hunting caribou
24 in Unit 22(A), and the State has said that there was
25 insufficient evidence in their opinion to provide for that
26 positive c&t determination.

27

28 As this is outside of Unit 22, another anthropologist
29 did the Staff work on this and I'm presenting it for her. That
30 was Pat McClenahan. She did a really good job of going back to
31 the communities to gather additional information to support the
32 c&t determination. And she actually went to Hooper Bay in
33 November of 1997 and residents from Hooper Bay and Scammon Bay
34 were there. Chevak's residents were weathered out and weren't
35 able to attend the meeting, but what she did was sit down with
36 maps and map out where people have gone caribou hunting in
37 recent years from Unit 18, going to up Unit 22(A). And that
38 map appears at the end of the analysis on page 31. Looks like
39 this.

40

41 And they've actually asked that the use area be not for
42 any one of those three villages because the three villages
43 often hunt together. And so it's mapped as being for all of
44 those three communities and those would be areas safe in going
45 into. I think what's happened and why the State has complained
46 about this, and it's not uncommon, it's happened in other areas
47 of the State, is that as populations of a resource fluctuate
48 and they migrate, if you have enough caribou right in the
49 vicinity of your village you won't go very far. But those
50 patterns shift through time and plus there's new technology

00077

1 now. People can go farther with snowmachines that are more
2 powerful. They're able to go longer distances. But it appears
3 that perhaps at some point there wasn't as much caribou hunting
4 going on up there, but that that has been a use that's been
5 reoccurring in more recent years.

6
7 There was also public testimony at the Federal
8 Subsistence Board meeting, as well as at the Regional Council
9 meeting to support the use in that area at the fall meeting
10 last fall, so this would have been new information since we met
11 last year. There was testimony from hunters from Hooper Bay,
12 Scammon Bay and Chevak, testifying that they go into that area
13 to take caribou. The remainder of the analysis, since we have
14 a pretty full agenda today, I won't go through all of it. It
15 was presented to you last year when the initial c&t
16 determination was done and there's not new information there.

17
18 The new information has been that information that I
19 just went over. But to summarize, our Staff felt that there
20 was enough information to support a positive c&t determination,
21 even though it's not in the harvest databases, it's not in the
22 literature that there has been use in those areas but there was
23 sufficient testimony from local people that people go up there
24 to hunt caribou, that they felt they should have a positive
25 c&t.

26
27 For public comments, the Chevak Traditional Council
28 submitted a comment, saying that the Kashunamiut tribe has used
29 the caribou in recent past, traveling great distances to
30 harvest them. Saying that they have hunted caribou in 22(A).
31 And that the customary and traditional use determination for
32 Unit 22(A) should include Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay and Chevak.
33 Those were the only written comments we received. And ADF&G
34 had no comment. But obviously since they submitted this
35 there.....

36
37 They haven't provided comment since this has been
38 written, but what they were looking for was more information to
39 substantiate the c&t determination and hopefully this will be
40 adequate. Do you have any questions?

41
42 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yeah, one question. I wonder why
43 they include Stebbins in Saint Michael Island. There's no
44 caribou in that area. There's reindeer, but there's no
45 caribou.

46
47 MS. ARMSTRONG: No caribou?

48
49 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Well, once in a while a caribou
50 mingle with the herd, but I don't know why they included

00078

1 Stebbins and Saint Michael Island.

2

3 MR. KATCHATAG: Maybe because they thought they went
4 through there too.

5

6 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay.

7

8 MS. ARMSTRONG: Since I wasn't there when they did the
9 mapping I really can't answer that question. But we could
10 certainly investigate that a little further, if you'd like.

11

12 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes.

13

14 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion to accept 97-12 as
15 customary and traditional. Because legends does prove it.
16 It's no different than Shishmaref going to Buckland for
17 caribou.

18

19 MR. KATCHATAG: Right. I second the motion.

20

21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motioned by.....

22

23 MR. ARMSTRONG: I think to clarify, to make it really
24 clear on the record, what you might want to say is that you
25 move to reject the RFR and to maintain the Board's decision,
26 just to make it really clear what you voted is what you're
27 supporting. Okay. So you're.....

28

29 MR. MENDENHALL: We're voting for them to have that
30 traditional hunt.

31

32 MS. ARMSTRONG: Right. Exactly.

33

34 MR. MENDENHALL: For the purpose of -- like people from
35 Nome go to White Mountain to get caribou. They travel a long
36 way for caribou. And they also trade for caribou. Customary
37 and traditional, twin areas.

38

39 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I don't have any problem with that.
40 I don't see any need to change this area. It be used as a
41 caribou subsistence use area. I don't see any need to.....

42

43 MR. MENDENHALL: The caribou is going further south
44 anyway.

45

46 MR. KATCHATAG: This way these people can more or less
47 find caribou straying. Most of them are going each year, you
48 know, they vary. The reason why we do this is because next
49 year the caribou might go through there and we'll have -- we'll
50 get out from their territory.

00079

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So is it in order for Perry to make
2 a motion to go ahead and adopt this proposal? Motion by Perry
3 to adopt Proposal -- support.....

4
5 MR. MENDENHALL: Support customary/traditional use.

6
7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK:customary and traditional use
8 area on Unit 22(A) .

9
10 MR. MENDENHALL: Call for the question.

11
12 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Is there a second?

13
14 MS. CROSS: Yeah, there was a second.

15
16 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Seconded by Grace or.....

17
18 MS. CROSS: No. He already seconded it.

19
20 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK:Fred.

21
22 MS. CROSS: Question.

23
24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All in favor signify by saying aye.

25
26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27
28 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll turn it back
29 over to Donna. She'll do the remainder of the proposal
30 analyses.

31
32 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Helen.

33
34 MR. KATCHATAG: Thank you for the information. Now I
35 know Chevak are my brothers.

36
37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Donna.

38
39 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion to adopt Proposal 86.
40 You've got to make the motion first before you discuss the
41 motion.

42
43 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay.

44
45 MR. MENDENHALL: I mean the proposal. We're following
46 the Roberts Rules of Orders.

47
48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion to adopt Proposal 86 by
49 Perry.

50

00080

1 MS. CROSS: I thought you already handled it.

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: For purpose of discussion.

4

5 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Is there a second to that motion?

6

7 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second the motion.

8

9 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Seconded by Johnson. All in favor
10 say aye.

11

12 IN UNISON: Aye.

13

14 MR. MENDENHALL: We make the motion first and then
15 discuss the proposal.

16

17 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay.

18

19 MR. MENDENHALL: You've got to present it.

20

21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Sorry.

22

23 MR. MENDENHALL: And then we call for question at the
24 discussion.

25

26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Perry. Donna?

27

28 MS. DEWHURST: So did you want a full presentation on
29 this or abbreviated or.....

30

31 MR. MENDENHALL: No, I mean it's up to the -- we
32 already discussed it in October and if we have no problem, we
33 can call for the question.

34

35 MS. DEWHURST: The one question I have is, is your
36 motion adopting our recommendations or is your motion --
37 because our recommendations were a little bit different than
38 the original proposal for 86.

39

40 The original proposal for 86 was to basically allow a
41 cow season for Unit 22(A) with no change in the season days,
42 but change it from an antlered bull season to one moose, which
43 would allow cows be taken. Our recommendations were don't go
44 as far as allowing a cow season, but to change the language
45 from one antlered bull to one bull, which would allow
46 antlerless bulls to be taken, but would still protect the cows.
47 So that was our recommendation. So it's a little bit different
48 than the original proposal. This proposal came from -- it
49 wasn't.....

50

00081

1 MR. MENDENHALL: It came from Fred?

2
3 MS. CROSS: No, it came from Ted.

4
5 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: It came from me.

6
7 MR. MENDENHALL: Come from us.

8
9 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes, it come from us.

10
11 MS. DEWHURST: And the reason for our modification was
12 the information from the State was that that moose population
13 is depressed right now, and the State was very concerned with
14 still protecting the cows. So having an antlerless bull season
15 would still allow you to take more than just an antlered bull,
16 you still could get antlerless bulls in the winter. But yet
17 the cows would still be protected. So that was it in a
18 nutshell.

19
20 MS. CROSS: Donna, I also noticed that you changed the
21 first date August 1 to September 3, instead of September 30th.
22 Is that the recommendation?

23
24 MR. BRELSFORD: In the text of your recommendation it's
25 still September 30.

26
27 MS. DEWHURST: Where is the September 3?

28
29 MR. BRELSFORD: On the executive summary.

30
31 MS. DEWHURST: Oh, okay. I wasn't even looking at
32 that.

33
34 MR. BRELSFORD: I caught the same thing, Grace.

35
36 MS. DEWHURST: Okay. That's a typo. There is no
37 change in season dates. The only change would be the original
38 request was for a cow season, we're saying not a cow season but
39 to allow antlerless bulls to be taken.

40
41 MS. CROSS: This is what they're recommending, one bull
42 with or without the antlers.

43
44 MS. DEWHURST: Which is a big deal. You know, any of
45 us that have hunted bulls in the -- hunted moose in the winter
46 after December, about mid-December most of the big bulls don't
47 have racks. So to have an antlerless season allows you to
48 still take a big bull after about mid-December.

49
50 MR. MENDENHALL: When they're hunting there, the fact

00082

1 remains that they have gone a long distance anyway. And the
2 purpose is for subsistence.

3
4 MS. DEWHURST: Right.

5
6 MR. MENDENHALL: And I think that was the discussion
7 that we had in Nome.

8
9 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So do we.....

10
11 MR. MENDENHALL: We just go with what we have there.
12 If you want to go there, or do you want to take Staff
13 recommendation to do this?

14
15 MS. CROSS: We can either continued with their proposed
16 regulation and say this is what we are going to go for. And
17 the Staff recommendation changed it, it would just be males
18 with or without antlers.

19
20 MR. MENDENHALL: Our motion was on this one. Now you
21 want to modify it for this. But if you call for a question on
22 it without modification, this goes.

23
24 MS. CROSS: So what was your -- you're the one that
25 brought it up, what's your preference?

26
27 MR. MENDENHALL: I don't want to get in the middle.

28
29 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Well, I guess it would be better if
30 we go ahead and support Staff recommendation.

31
32 MR. KATCHATAG: And the reason why there's a lot of
33 bulls this year is because of that fire in -- nearby.

34
35 MR. MENDENHALL: You call for question on this?

36
37 MR. KATCHATAG: Yeah, I'll call the question on that.

38
39 MR. MENDENHALL: Question's been called.

40
41 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Discussion?

42
43 MR. MENDENHALL: Question's been called already.

44
45 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. All in favor of Proposal 85
46 as one moose.....

47
48 MR. MENDENHALL: Aye.

49
50 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All in favor say aye.

00083

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 MS. DEWHURST: Was that with the recommendation or
4 without? Are you going with the Staff.....

5

6 MR. MENDENHALL: As to the proposed regulation I
7 presented. It was not amended to.....

8

9 MS. CROSS: The original proposal.

10

11 MS. DEWHURST: So you guys voted on the cow season
12 then?

13

14 MR. MENDENHALL: Right. The purpose -- I think it was
15 at length discussed because the people spend that much time,
16 energy and gas and that's the only thing that's there.

17

18 MR. KATCHATAG: Now where are we?

19

20 MS. DEWHURST: 87 is the next one.

21

22 MR. MENDENHALL: 87.

23

24 MS. DEWHURST: No.

25

26 MR. MENDENHALL: This has been passed, it's been
27 adopted the way you wanted it.

28

29 MS. DEWHURST: That's the original proposal. They
30 voted to support the original proposal, not the Staff
31 recommendation.

32

33 MR. EDENSHAW: What was the original proposal?

34

35 MS. DEWHURST: Cow season. To allow any -- one moose,
36 it doesn't matter what sex or anything else. The next proposal
37 starts at page 43, the analysis. It's very similar, only in a
38 different area. The original was there again to change it from
39 one antlered bull to one moose, which would there again allow a
40 cow season.

41

42 The area we're talking about -- because we're only
43 dealing with Federal land, when the State brought this up they
44 said, well let's make the Federal and the State proposals the
45 same. Well, that was well and good but then when we actually
46 looked at where Federal land was, it's just a little tiny piece
47 of area. On the map after page 43, you can see the only area
48 we're talking about is the Kuzitrin Drainage. The Kuzitrin
49 Drainage is in that dark gray shaded area, these three little
50 forks.

00084

1 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion to adopt Proposal 87
2 for purpose of discussion.

3
4 MS. CROSS: I second the motion.

5
6 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion by Perry to adopt Proposal
7 87 for discussion.

8
9 MR. MENDENHALL: This is the one proposed by Elmer.

10
11 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Seconded by Grace. All in favor
12 say aye.

13
14 IN UNISON: Aye.

15
16 MR. MENDENHALL: You've got to discuss it first, the
17 motion can be made then you discuss.

18
19 MR. KATCHATAG: We're moving along.

20
21 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay. You already did that. And so
22 it's already passed by

23
24 MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be
25 helpful, remember that what we're doing here is making
26 recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board and the Board
27 will be particularly concerned with your reasons for a vote,
28 with your thinking, your rationale. So it would be helpful to
29 in making the motion articu -- you know, say something about
30 why you make this particular motion. It seems to me that this
31 vote might have snuck by you.

32
33 MR. MENDENHALL: It did.

34
35 MR. BRELSFORD: And we didn't hear a clear statement of
36 the purpose of the recommendation of the Council.

37
38 MR. MENDENHALL: We did discuss it at length in Nome
39 and it was proposed by Elmer representing Brevig and Teller.
40 And the reason is that they do go a long ways up the Kuzitrin,
41 which is about a hundred miles to hunt moose in that area
42 because that's usually where it goes up for winter. And that's
43 the reason Elmer and them looked at it.

44
45 MS. CROSS: And to make the Federal regulations
46 consistent with the State regulations because there's no
47 visible boundaries between the Federal land and the State land,
48 was the understanding that I got at that meeting.

49
50 MR. MENDENHALL: Right.

00085

1 MS. CROSS: Was that it invites somebody to go in
2 violation of some sort of regulation. And if the State moose
3 goes over to the Fed land and the State allows cows to be shot,
4 a person may not know because there's no known boundaries that
5 are visible.

6
7 MR. MENDENHALL: You may wound one on the State land
8 and then it goes and drops on Federal land. See that's the
9 problem with that.

10
11 MS. DEWHURST: Then one clarification here, and I kind
12 of stated this wrong, it's actually the other way around. This
13 proposal would limit subsistence users. Right now they can
14 take antlerless moose. This would limit them to an antlered
15 bull. I actually stated it backwards. So if you passed this
16 proposal this would put a further limitation on subsistence
17 users. When I discussed it back with Sheldon last fall when he
18 was still on the Council, Sheldon had a real problem with that
19 in that he had told me at the time that he was going to
20 recommend to the Council to withdraw this proposal because he
21 was concerned that this proposal originated in the Council and
22 was actually proposing to further restrict subsistence users,
23 i.e., somebody from Brevig or Teller going up into that area
24 and going all the way up there and then suddenly they're
25 restricted to an antlered bull.

26
27 One clarification, this proposal was originally made by
28 Peter Bente and then it was discussed by Elmer. And the reason
29 I think Elmer went along with it was because the numbers in
30 that area along the Kuzitrin, the moose numbers are depressed
31 there, they're down. And that's why I think Elmer agreed. And
32 it sounded too like not that many people go up there. And from
33 what I've seen, I was just flying in that area, and I didn't
34 see very many moose up there. I guess the bottom line is my
35 own personal opinion is I don't think it's a huge factor one
36 way or the other. There are not a lot of moose up there and
37 it's a long ways for anybody to go up there. You can get moose
38 a lot closer. But it's up to you, it's up to the Council. But
39 this proposal actually proposed to limit it. What I made in
40 the Staff recommendation was a moderation, in between. They're
41 saying to go all the way to an antlered bull for one moose.
42 I'm saying to go in between and say you can take an antlerless
43 moose, and namely an antlerless bull, and not -- so there again
44 it's still protecting the cows, but it would not be as
45 restrictive as saying you can only take an antlered bull.

46
47 MR. MENDENHALL: You're saying that Peter did and Elmer
48 discussed it because.....

49
50 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, that's what I remember.

00086

1 MR. MENDENHALL: I thought it was coming from Elmer.

2

3 MS. DEWHURST: No, this is one of the ones that Peter
4 made up that said -- not made up, but he brought up that was
5 trying to align the Federal and State regulations. Because the
6 State's already done this for the whole Kuzitrin Drainage.
7 They say that you have to take an antlerless bull for the whole
8 Kuzitrin and several other drainages, but they don't have
9 Federal lands on them. And from what I remember there was some
10 discussion, but the discussion was along the lines of well we
11 can support that restriction because we understand that moose
12 are herding in that area and we'd like to see moose rebound.
13 And that was kind of the discussion. But I'm not sure it was
14 really clear last fall.

15

16 And in all honesty it wasn't really clear to me when it
17 was presented, that this would present an actual further
18 restriction to subsistence users. And when I discussed it with
19 Sheldon, Sheldon didn't like that and he was like, well I want
20 to withdraw that proposal because I don't want it coming from
21 this Council that we want to restrict subsistence users. But
22 that was his opinion and I'm just relaying that since he isn't
23 on the Council anymore.

24

25 You know, basically you have three options. You can go
26 with this with the State so that all the regulations are
27 consistent no matter where you're hunting, like Grace said. No
28 matter where you are you have the same rules. Or you could
29 totally reject this proposal. Either withdraw it or reject it.
30 Or you could go the middle ground which was the Staff
31 recommendation to say, well we won't go so far as saying you
32 have to take an antlered bull, but we will go to say let's
33 protect the cows and you have to get a bull, whether it has
34 antlers or not. So that's kind of the middle ground. So you
35 can go to either extreme, to support the State and say that you
36 have to take an antlered bull, go to the middle ground which is
37 the Staff's recommendation, just one bull, whether it has
38 antlers or not, or totally reject or withdraw the proposal.

39

40 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any comment from the Council?

41

42 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, they drop their antlers in
43 December.

44

45 MS. DEWHURST: The big bulls will start dropping them
46 about the 5th or 6th.

47

48 MR. MENDENHALL: It's going to be hard to tell between
49 the cow and bull unless they're in shallow snow.

50

00087

1 MS. DEWHURST: I've seen yearlings keep antlers through
2 January, but that's a little stubby -- little fork yearlings.
3 Most of the big guys drop them early.

4
5 MR. MENDENHALL: There's hardly any snow up in that
6 area either.

7
8 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, there wasn't much. I was just up
9 there flying, there isn't a lot of snow up in that area. And
10 most of the rivers I've over-flown.

11
12 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, what we was wanting to do is so
13 they don't shoot one and then get arrested on another one if
14 the bull gets -- or whatever goes on different land. We're
15 trying to keep consistent.

16
17 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: The reason I got confused earlier
18 was a motion was made and then usually when there's motion made
19 there's usually a second.....

20
21 MR. MENDENHALL: You didn't have a motion.

22
23 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: And so my experience in meetings is
24 there's always discussion and comments first before the motion
25 is made. But I guess I've been misled by some people.....

26
27 MR. MENDENHALL: You have to motion before a
28 discussion. It has to be discussed before the question is
29 called. And when they call question, then you take a vote.

30
31 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Perry.

32
33 MR. MENDENHALL: That's the proper if we're following
34 Roberts Rules of Order.

35
36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Anything else you need to add,
37 Donna?

38
39 MS. DEWHURST: Do you want to go over the other
40 comments, the State's comments?

41
42 MR. MENDENHALL: You want to amend it to -- turn to
43 page 41.

44
45 MR. KATCHATAG: A lot of the times they don't discuss
46 them anyway.

47
48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: It's up to the Council what they
49 want to do.

50

00088

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Call for the question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question's been called. Are we
4 supporting Staff recommendation?

5

6 MR. MENDENHALL: No, we -- it's on this one here.

7

8 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay.

9

10 MR. MENDENHALL: That's out. The question's been
11 called.

12

13 MS. CROSS: All in favor of the original proposal.

14

15 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question's been called. All in
16 favor say aye.

17

18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19

20 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Those opposed no.

21

22 (No opposing responses)

23

24 MS. CROSS: And that would be on this here, original
25 proposed.

26

27 MR. KATCHATAG: Now, where are we.

28

29 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We're done with Proposal 87.

30

31 MS. DEWHURST: This will be 88, which is the analysis
32 is on page 51.

33

34 MR. EDENSHAW: Excuse me, Mr. Chair?

35

36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes, go ahead, Cliff.

37

38 MR. EDENSHAW: Can I make another comment? I think
39 initially on the agenda here for all the procedures, so that we
40 can have some clarity, with the bio-socio analysis, Donna. I
41 don't think Helen has any more c&t's. ADF&G comments, these
42 are comments that we received that are also included in the
43 proposal analysis, as well as written public comments, and then
44 these Regional Council deliberation recommendation. As Taylor
45 expressed, if you're going to recommend adoption or a
46 recommendation of a Staff Committee's recommendation or
47 modifications, it's important that we have the justification if
48 you're going to go against -- if you're going to modify or
49 choose not to accept the Staff proposal, what is inside the
50 analysis.

00089

1 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, you want clarification of 87, in
2 other words. Okay. I think the motion was for the proposed
3 regulation as submitted by the Council, and that was a motion
4 to accept as was. And on 87 they discussed that recommendation
5 and propose to go with the original proposal without Staff
6 recommendation. And that was passed.

7
8 Another thing before we get into 88 is that we have to
9 make a positive motion, Mr. Chair. And regardless of that,
10 like we have to say I make a motion to adopt such and such a
11 proposal. That doesn't -- I mean I may be for it, but there's
12 a purpose for discussion, okay. Then discussion is made and
13 then you can vote against it after the question, nay or yeah.

14
15 MS. CROSS: And did we get to the reasoning behind your
16 I don't think so. That's what you're requesting, right?

17
18 MR. MENDENHALL: That's what he's wanting,
19 justification why we voted the way we did.

20
21 MS. CROSS: Okay. I think two reasons that I heard was
22 that the proposal was supported by those people that are most
23 affected by the original proposal by the State. And the main
24 reason is that they decided that to change a regulation to be
25 consistent with the State is to avoid enforcement problems and
26 because the moose population is not as healthy as it was
27 before. That's the reason that were give at the October
28 meeting.

29
30 MR. MENDENHALL: That was the other one. That was the
31 other leg that we stood on.

32
33 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Grace. Any other
34 comments. Go on to Proposal 88.

35
36 MR. MENDENHALL: Page 49.

37
38 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Donna?

39
40 MS. DEWHURST: 51 is the beginning of the analysis.

41
42 MR. MENDENHALL: Before, we have to make a motion to
43 adopt Proposal 88.

44
45 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

46
47 MR. MENDENHALL: For purpose of discussion. Clarify
48 that now. I don't see any village action taken on this
49 Proposal 88.

50

00090

1 MS. DEWHURST: This was submitted by an individual.

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: Submitted by an individual. And I
4 think we have -- and that's my comment. And whether there was
5 any community involvement in this.

6

7 MS. CROSS: Proposal 88 on the very front where it says
8 issues.

9

10 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: This Golovin?

11

12 MS. CROSS: Right. Page 51.

13

14 MR. MENDENHALL: Because we'd go into Darby Mountain
15 and those other outlining areas.

16

17 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Peter, do you have any comment on
18 this Proposal 88 for musk-ox?

19

20 MR. BUCK: I wish I can cover without my -- as I say,
21 all my information is in White Mountain. I have no way of
22 knowing. But if it concerns musk-ox, I'd like to hear more
23 about the proposal. I mean I don't have any paperwork on me
24 right now. I have no idea what the proposal is.

25

26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. We'll go ahead and turn the
27 floor over to Donna so she could.....

28

29 This was submitted by Mark McAlister in Golovin, and it
30 was to open up and establish a musk-ox harvest, subsistence
31 harvest in Unit 22(B) only on Federal lands and it'd be by
32 Federal registration permit and the season would be closed when
33 the maximum of five bulls have been harvested in 22(B). That
34 was the original proposal and it was submitted by an
35 individual. He didn't state season dates, so it's kind of
36 assumed that they would go along with the same season dates as
37 the rest of the Seward-Pen.

38

39 MR. MENDENHALL: And your Staff recommendation is?

40

41 MS. DEWHURST: The Staff recommendation is we strongly
42 reject the proposal. Our reasoning is, as far as we're aware
43 of there are not musk-ox in Federal lands in 22(B), which is
44 about as strong of a recommendation. If you look on the next
45 page, it gives the table and showing the numbers that have been
46 surveyed in 1992, 1994, 1996. I can personally add for 1998,
47 last week I was in an airplane for four days surveying that
48 area personally and in that area we flew for about two and a
49 half days, in the two of six, and looked very carefully for
50 musk-ox and did not find a musk-ox on Federal lands in 22(B).

00091

1 Now, that's not to say there couldn't be musk-ox off
2 Federal lands. But we checked Federal lands very, very
3 carefully because I knew this proposal was in the works and I
4 knew it was very important to get accurate information. So I
5 can personally say I was in the airplane and we didn't see one.
6 We looked pretty hard.

7
8 MR. BUCK: This is Peter Buck again. We'll go with the
9 Staff recommendation. I would approve the recommendation of
10 the proposal because in White Mountain we don't want musk-ox.
11 If they do show up we'd like to get rid of them.

12
13 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Perry?

14
15 MR. MENDENHALL: I would support Staff recommendation.
16 And I'd also like to concur with the Musk-ox Cooperators that
17 met as well.

18
19 MS. DEWHURST: They did.

20
21 MR. MENDENHALL: And they opposed it as well.

22
23 MS. DEWHURST: Right. The Musk-ox Cooperators did
24 oppose it.

25
26 MR. MENDENHALL: And I would like to concur with the
27 Musk-ox Cooperators that opposed it.

28
29 MS. DEWHURST: The problem you would have if you
30 supported it is if you established a harvest, you have to have
31 a percentage of the number of animals that we know in that
32 area.

33
34 MR. MENDENHALL: To draw from.

35
36 MS. DEWHURST: So what do you do a percentage of zero.
37 It would be hard to even say how many animals they could hunt
38 if we don't know of any animals in that area.

39
40 MS. CROSS: This is Grace Cross. It seems to me that
41 when musk-oxen goes to the area in the future, and that is when
42 we should address it. But right now when there's zero
43 population we cannot project whether or not they're going to be
44 there to begin with. At the time that the musk-ox gets there,
45 then we can get a proposal from the respective villages that
46 are affected by it and we'll address it at that time.

47
48 MS. DEWHURST: And it sounds like from what we're
49 hearing now, we didn't see them, but we heard reports that
50 there are musk-ox west of Elim and some of those areas, but

00092

1 they aren't on Federal lands and this proposal is only for
2 Federal lands. So I think that's where there might have been
3 some misunderstanding by Mr. McAlister that he's seen musk-ox
4 in the area, but those Federal lands are very limited in 22(B).
5 So he would be better off to have a State proposal than a
6 Federal one.

7

8 MR. MENDENHALL: If there is a question called my vote
9 would be no.

10

11 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I'll entertain a motion to.....

12

13 MS. CROSS: They've already got it.

14

15 MR. MENDENHALL: You need to entertain a question.

16

17 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes. Is there a question.

18

19 MR. KATCHATAG: Question.

20

21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question called by Fred. All in
22 favor say aye.

23

24 MR. KATCHATAG: Aye.

25

26 MR. MENDENHALL: All opposed same sign.

27

28 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All opposed same sign.

29

30 MR. MENDENHALL: Aye. Okay. The proposal failed.

31

32 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Proposal 88.

33

34 MR. MENDENHALL: Proposal 88.

35

36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: It's no longer.....

37

38 MS. DEWHURST: And like I said, it doesn't mean it's
39 dead forever if musk-ox do move into the area the proposal can
40 be resubmitted.

41

42 MR. KATCHATAG: Fly there in June, maybe there'll be
43 lots of musk-ox.

44

45 MS. CROSS: Peter, are you hearing all of this?

46

47 MR. BUCK: Yeah, I hear. I'd just like to say that
48 White Mountain do not want musk-ox. So that would be my
49 opinion.

50

00093

1 MS. DEWHURST: Well, Peter, I flew all around that area
2 of White Mountain and saw tons of caribou and a few moose, but
3 didn't see a musk-ox. So I think you're pretty safe so far.
4

5 MR. BUCK: We'd like to get permission to shoot them if
6 they come in. I think that Staff has a pretty good point that
7 the population isn't big enough, but we still oppose it. Thank
8 you.
9

10 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Next item, Donna, Proposal 89.
11

12 MS. DEWHURST: It's 89. I'll summarize it real quick
13 and then you can present it.....
14

15 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion for adoption of
16 Proposal 89 for purpose of discussion.
17

18 MS. CROSS: I second the motion.
19

20 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Discussion.
21

22 MR. MENDENHALL: And I think Ken Adkisson and them just
23 had Cooperative audio conferences last week, which Grace and I
24 also sat in on and I think I will hear from both people, I
25 guess.
26

27 MS. DEWHURST: This proposal has had wide support, with
28 the modification changing it from March 31st to March 16th.
29 That was brought up at the Cooperators and the Cooperators did
30 support the modification, which would be just cutting it off
31 about two weeks in March. It still extends the season earlier
32 to August 1st and it extends it considerably later. The
33 original regulations ended the end of January. So it does
34 extend it still a month and a half past January.
35

36 The reason for cutting it back to March 16th is that
37 they will start dropping calves as early as early April. And
38 there was concern to protect those pregnant cows from
39 disturbance at the later part of March. Plus that is a period
40 when the animals are in high stress, there's not much to eat,
41 they're out in the snow. They're in a time period where they
42 don't feed very often and they don't move around very much,
43 they tend to be pretty tight grouped and stressing them by
44 chasing them with snow machines can affect them pretty
45 severely. So you could have animals dying, not being
46 harvested. They could be dying or being sick by the stress
47 created.
48

49 So the concern was to just knock the proposal back two
50 weeks, but it still gives quite an extension. It was supported

00094

1 very strongly by folks in Wales and Shishmaref, which Johnson
2 probably remembers at the Cooperators meeting, the August 1st
3 especially because that would allow people to get out earlier
4 when you can still go out by boat and access some areas where
5 musk-ox are on Federal lands.

6
7 So in general the proposal had wide acceptance. We've
8 had three special actions in the past year to extend the season
9 into March, and this would basically make it a permanent
10 extension. So the question really comes to whether you want to
11 go with the original proposal or go with the general consensus
12 of the March 16th modifications -- 15th, I'm sorry.
13 Correction, 15th.

14
15 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I'd like to hear from Ken, do you
16 have anything to add to this? Any comments?

17
18 MS. CROSS: We'd like to hear specifically of the
19 meetings that you had recent.

20
21 MR. ADKISSON: My name is Ken Adkisson, I'm with the
22 National Park Service in Nome, and also co-chair of the
23 Musk-oxen Cooperators Working Group. Generally speaking, this
24 proposal as recommended to be modified so that it's August 1st-
25 March 15th, we received wide support at the Cooperators meeting
26 in late January. Since then we've had public meetings or
27 teleconferences with all of the hunt area villages. And this
28 proposal as modified has also received widespread support from
29 all six of the hunt area villages.

30
31 There's been a little bit of discussion on the part of
32 Wales to actually have a season in July. And their reason is
33 that they've had several years of poor marine mammal hunting
34 and moose seem down in their area, and they would really like
35 musk-oxen when they're closer to home. They will probably be
36 looking at that possibly as a form of a special action. So
37 they're not really recommending that this proposal as stated
38 here to be modified should be changed, that was just their
39 comment.

40
41 There's one comment from the Alaska Department of Fish
42 and Game that says the seven month long hunting season proposed
43 by this amendment should offer adequate opportunity for
44 subsistence hunters. At the Musk-oxen Cooperators meeting I
45 showed materials that demonstrated that largely due to weather
46 conditions there's a limited amount of hunting right at the
47 beginning of the current September opening, and then in many
48 cases nothing until the very tail end of the season.

49
50 And, as Donna has pointed out to you, we've had three

00095

1 extensions now each year that the hunt's been in operation.
2 And I brought with me, which I'll save for later, but
3 information on this year's current hunt which has just
4 concluded. And there we issued 23 permits, nine permits were
5 filled. So less than half of the permits were actually filled
6 and the bulk of the harvest came during the extension. So I
7 think there's a good case for this proposal as serving the
8 subsistence needs, you know, better meeting the subsistence
9 needs of the hunt area villages.

10
11 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Ken.

12
13 MS. DEWHURST: I forgot to mention too, this proposal
14 was brought up to the Northwest Arctic Council when they had
15 their meeting. They did support this proposal with the
16 modification of March 15th. So that was their vote.

17
18 MR. ADKISSON: Oh, there's one other thing. I also
19 believe that I think you'll find that the Alaska Department of
20 Fish and Game is probably a little more -- you know, it would
21 be more amicable to this now. And I think you'll see this
22 carried over next month at the Alaska Board of Game when they
23 take up musk-oxen. I think you'll see a discussion there of
24 extending the season too.

25
26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Mr. Eningowuk?

27
28 MR. ENINGOWUK: I guess the motion was to that Proposal
29 89. What's the procedure to include the Staff recommendations
30 on that motion? Does that need another motion to modify the
31 proposed regulation? Because that proposed regulation is
32 August 1st to March 31st, and the Staff support is August 1st
33 to March 15th. Do we need another motion to amend it?

34
35 MR. MENDENHALL: To amend it to reflect the 15th
36 instead of 31st?

37
38 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes, I think.....

39
40 MR. ENINGOWUK: Then I'll make that motion to amend the
41 motion to.....

42
43 MS. CROSS: Support Staff recommendation?

44
45 MR. ENINGOWUK:support Staff recommendation.

46
47 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motioned by Johnson to support
48 Staff recommendation to change the season dates.

49
50 MR. MENDENHALL: Only that he added these two.

00096

1 MS. CROSS: He amended the original motion.

2

3 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. Motion was to amend original
4 motion.

5

6 MS. CROSS: To reflect March 1st to March 15th hunting
7 season.

8

9 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: To reflect March 1st to March 15.
10 Do we have a second?

11

12 MS. CROSS: Second.

13

14 MR. MENDENHALL: She did.

15

16 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Oh, there was a second already, I'm
17 sorry. All in favor of the motion.....

18

19 MR. MENDENHALL: Call for question.

20

21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: The question has been called. All
22 in favor say aye.

23

24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25

26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Those opposed no.

27

28 (No opposing responses)

29

30 MR. MENDENHALL: That's a few less moose for you,
31 Peter. I mean musk-ox.

32

33 MR. ENINGOWUK: Mr. Chairman, we just got through
34 voting on the amendment. Now, do we get back to the main
35 motion? And I call for question.

36

37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Call for question on the main
38 motion. All in favor say aye.

39

40 IN UNISON: Aye.

41

42 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All opposed no.

43

44 (No opposing responses)

45

46 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion carried on the main motion.
47 Well, thank you. Go on, Donna.

48

49 MS. DEWHURST: Did Perry want to make a motion first?

50

00097

1 MR. MENDENHALL: Here's your beaver.

2
3 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Do we have a motion to.....

4
5 MR. MENDENHALL: I so move.

6
7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK:approve Proposal 90. Motioned
8 by Perry to adopt proposal 90.

9
10 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

11
12 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Seconded by Fred. Discussion.

13
14 MS. DEWHURST: This proposal is for beaver hunting and
15 trapping, which was discussed earlier today. There again this
16 is one that was originally presented by Peter Bente as a way of
17 aligning the State and Federal regulations. The State's
18 already adopted this, so it's a matter of us following through
19 to parallel. It would basically extend the season from April
20 15th through June 10th, is really the only action involved.

21
22 This is Beaver hunting and trapping and it's for 22(D),
23 and it would be extending April 15th through June 10th. In a
24 nutshell, beavers have been documented, as Mr. Katchatag's
25 mentioned, the numbers are increasing in Seward Peninsula.
26 It's pretty well documented. It hasn't been that long ago when
27 the first lodges were even identified or found in 22(D), and
28 now they're pretty widespread from what I understand. So the
29 beavers are expanding westward in Seward-Pen. They're marching
30 their way west and starting to impact more.

31
32 There is some concern been expressed about beavers and
33 interest in taking them. This proposal, like I say, is pretty
34 straightforward. The one change the Staff recommended, the
35 Staff supported this proposal, but noted that -- and this was
36 probably just an oversight by Peter Bente, that the State also
37 made the same change in 22(E). And so our Staff recommendation
38 was to fully go along with the State, we should expand the
39 season from April 15th to June 10th, but for 22(D) and 22(E),
40 where the original proposal didn't mention 22(E). But the
41 State has already made that change. I think it was just an
42 oversight by Peter.

43
44 And when I checked the two regulations I'm like, whoa,
45 if we're going to do it, we should do it for all areas. So, as
46 Grace mentioned, the regulations are the same no matter where
47 you are.

48
49 MR. MENDENHALL: Comment should be made to this motion
50 that we're concerned for salmon fisheries as well, and other

00098

1 fisheries in those streams that are affected by beaver. I call
2 for question. I mean I question.

3

4 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question's been called. All in
5 favor say aye.

6

7 MR. MENDENHALL: To adopt with the recommendation of
8 Staff.

9

10 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: This is Proposal 90 with
11 recommendation from the Staff.

12

13 MR. MENDENHALL: If we follow Johnson, then we need to
14 vote on that recommendation of the staff to be added to this.

15

16 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. How do we.....

17

18 MR. MENDENHALL: We never did that. The motion was to
19 the main proposal. We need to vote -- I make a motion to amend
20 the proposed regulations with Staff recommendation.

21

22 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.

23

24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motioned by Perry, seconded by
25 Johnson. All in favor of the proposal amendment signify by
26 saying aye.

27

28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29

30 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Those opposed no.

31

32 (No opposing responses)

33

34 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion carried.

35

36 MR. MENDENHALL: Now, I call for question on the main
37 motion as amended.

38

39 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question's been called for the main
40 motion with the amendment. All in favor say aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Opposed no.

45

46 (No opposing responses)

47

48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion's passed. The next item.

49

50 MS. DEWHURST: Proposal 91, which is the last proposal.

00099

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I'll entertain a motion to adopt
2 Proposal 91.

3
4 MS. CROSS: I so move.

5
6 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motioned by Grace to adopt Proposal
7 91.

8
9 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.

10
11 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Seconded by Johnson. Discussion.

12
13 MS. DEWHURST: This is there again another pretty short
14 one. This was not one where you're aligning State and Fed.
15 This was a proposal I believe made by Perry, if I remember
16 correct. I was trying to remember back who actually suggested
17 it. It's to change wolverine hunting limit from one to three
18 animals for all of Unit 22.

19
20 I was just reading recently, wolverines have actually
21 been on the Seward Peninsula since the Ice Age. They have
22 wolverine bones clear back then. So they've been around for a
23 long time, been hunted for a long time and they're still
24 around. So they manage to survive no matter who and, yeah,
25 they're tough critters. The Staff does not oppose this
26 recommendation. We fully support this recommendation with no
27 modifications. Looking at other area wolverine trapping
28 regulations, the rule variables, some areas have a limit of
29 five, which is more liberal.

30
31 Several of the areas, Units 18, 20, 23 and 26 all have
32 limits of five. So it's actually more liberal than the three.
33 And wolverine trapping right now has no limit. So upping your
34 hunting from one to three animals we don't anticipate to have
35 any significant impacts on the population in the area.

36
37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Excuse me, Donna.

38
39 MS. DEWHURST: Sure.

40
41 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I recall the Stebbins IRA Council
42 supporting or making a similar motion to proposal to bring that
43 from one to three. So there's support from the Stebbins IRA
44 Council.

45
46 MS. DEWHURST: And the actual harvest records, both
47 hunting and trapping, which isn't really well differentiated in
48 the harvest records, the tickets, but it has been declining.
49 And I suspect that's just more related to the fur market, that
50 the price of fur has been going down. So what usually that

00100

1 means is people are still out there hunting and trapping, but
2 they're aren't actually sealing the hides because they don't
3 want to sell them. And if you don't sell the hide you don't
4 have to seal it, so why bother. People are just cutting them
5 up and making them into their own clothing. And I suspect the
6 same amount of hunting and trapping is going on, but just
7 people aren't sealing as many as they used to because their
8 commercial value isn't there any more.

9
10 MR. MENDENHALL: Anywhere you have reindeer and caribou
11 they're there.

12
13 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah.

14
15 MR. MENDENHALL: Call for question.

16
17 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Call for question.

18
19 MS. CROSS: Question.

20
21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question's been called. All in
22 favor say aye.

23
24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25
26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Those opposed no.

27
28 MS. CROSS: Are you there, Peter?

29
30 MR. BUCK: I'm here.

31
32 MS. DEWHURST: Before we break for lunch I'll just give
33 you guys a quick, real brief summary. I was involved in the
34 musk-ox survey for this past year. It was completed, to my
35 knowledge, for all of Seward Peninsula. We don't have numbers
36 yet. Other than I can tell you what I saw, which I had two
37 groups south of Buckland, which was further east than they've
38 been seen before. They were just a little bit south of
39 Buckland, and then we also saw I think four or five groups west
40 of Mount Bendeleben, which is up around Kougarok, right around
41 where the road ends, Quartz Creek area. I think we had four or
42 five groups in that area. But we didn't see hardly anything
43 east of there.

44
45 And we extended the survey quite a bit. We actually
46 surveyed south of Shaktoolik and over in the spruce woods all
47 east of there going up into the mountains, east of Koyuk, east
48 of Shaktoolik. So it was quite an extensive change. We went
49 quite a bit further east looking for musk-ox, see if they made
50 it over there. We might have missed one or two, but I don't

00101

1 think we missed any big numbers. The musk-ox are real easy to
2 see from the air in the snow. You can see them for miles off.
3 And we saw thousands and thousands of caribou.

4
5 There's about 3,000 caribou staging right now just
6 north of the lava fields. In Bering Land Bridge there were
7 about 3,000 animals just grouped up right there. Otherwise,
8 there were caribou everywhere. Small groups, 20-50 animals
9 just everywhere I looked. All around Koyuk, all around White
10 Mountain, all around Elim, all the villages up to Buckland,
11 small groups, but they are starting to line out to the east.
12 They are starting to move, which is the time of year, so it
13 isn't a big surprise. And that's basically what we saw. I
14 think by the end of this week the numbers should be out for the
15 whole survey area and we should know the numbers.

16
17 From what I heard talking to the guys that flew further
18 west, I think the numbers are going to be up. It sounded like
19 22(E), the Shishmaref/Wales area, you guys called it, they
20 counted over 300. And you guys called it right on the money at
21 the Cooperators meeting. So pat yourselves on the back because
22 that's what you told us it would be. And from what I heard
23 from the Park Service folks, it is. I don't know the exact
24 numbers. So hopefully by the end of this week the numbers
25 should be out. But I think they're going to be higher overall
26 for the whole area. So we'll see soon.

27
28 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Donna. We'll break for
29 lunch. One hour.

30
31 (Off record)

32
33 (On record)

34
35 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Grace, we're ready. Thank you.
36 I'll call the meeting back to order, 1:45. Ken, were you next?
37 Yes, we have you down. Ken Adkisson.

38
39 MS. CROSS: Peter, are you there? Peter?

40
41 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes. You may take the floor, Mr.
42 Adkisson.

43
44 MR. ADKISSON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and Council
45 members. My name is Ken Adkisson and I'm here today on behalf
46 of the Seward Peninsula Musk-oxen Cooperators Working Group.
47 My position there is co-chair of the group. I'm here to talk
48 about recent developments with the management and the harvest
49 scenarios for the Seward Peninsula musk-oxen.

50

1 The State Board of Game will be meeting in Fairbanks
2 next week and they will be taking action on proposals related
3 to the Seward Peninsula musk-oxen. Those proposals may have an
4 affect on Federally eligible users. And one of the things that
5 we've heard in meeting after meeting is people's desire to see
6 the Federal system working with the State system. And I think
7 it's important that you as a Federal Regional Advisory Council
8 have input into the State process if we're to try to work
9 through some of the problems that affect our eligible users as
10 a result of the dual management situation that we're faced.

11
12 I'd like to begin by just touching on some recent
13 information related to the Seward Peninsula musk-oxen
14 population. I won't add much to what Donna has already said
15 about the count that is just now underway or about to wrap up.
16 All indications that I've heard from the folks doing the count
17 is that the population is up from the '96 count. But until all
18 of the participating agencies have their information in to
19 Peter Bente with ADF&G and he puts it together, we won't have
20 the official figures. So I really won't talk much more about
21 that, other than to say that they're up.

22
23 I've got information on the success of this year's '97-
24 98 hunt. And this too should be treated somewhat informally as
25 it's a result of basically a telephone poll of the villages
26 that Fred talked to of our office of the Park Service just
27 completed. And it may change just a little bit, depending upon
28 actual hunter's reports. But it's probably pretty close.

29
30 We actually issued 23 permits for this year's hunt. To
31 the best of our knowledge nine of those were filled. So we
32 didn't have a very good success rate this year. By village
33 that broke down to Buckland, they were issued three and they
34 filled none. Deering was issued three, they filled none.
35 Shishmaref was issued six, they filled five. Wales was issued
36 three and filled none. Brevig Mission was issued four and
37 filled one. Teller was issued four and they filled three.

38
39 Interestingly enough, one of those apparently is
40 supposed to have come off of National Park Service lands in
41 eastern 22(D), which we weren't really expecting. Almost all
42 of the harvest to the best of our knowledge has come basically
43 in the latter part of the season and as a result of this year's
44 hunt extension from January 31st to March 15th. So it
45 indicates how important that late winter/early spring harvest
46 is to folks. It also I think points out the difficulty that
47 Federal users are having associated with the Federal hunt,
48 being forced to travel long distances to access Federal land to
49 find legal animals. And especially facing conditions like this
50 year, there were poor snow cover, when the snow did come it was

00103

1 too warm.

2

3 And, as Donna has pointed out in her presentation,
4 there's a tremendous amount of weak ice overflow out there in
5 the country and it's really especially for the folks like, and
6 I'll just refer you to the map up here, for the villages like
7 Brevig and Teller to have to travel all the way over to the
8 Seward Peninsula to look for their animals. It's actually I
9 think, you know, asking them to almost undertake a hazardous
10 trip for this hunting. Buckland in some cases has to go all
11 the way over to the National Preserve over here. That's the
12 kind of thing that they're faced with.

13

14 I presented information at the last Regional Advisory
15 Council meeting or when we tried to meet in Unalakleet and I
16 won't go over a lot of that information about the Federal
17 harvest and when it takes place and so forth. Are there any
18 questions at this point on the count or this year's harvest
19 information?

20

21 MS. DEWHURST: Ken, could you go over just real quick
22 the count breakdown again?

23

24 MR. ADKISSON: Sure. There were 23 permits issued,
25 nine filled. Buckland issued three, filled none. Deering
26 three, filled none. Shishmaref six, filled five. And by the
27 way, each of the three years of the hunt they've been by far
28 and away the most successful village. Wales issued three,
29 filled none. Brevig Mission issued four and filled one.
30 Teller issued four and they filled three. And two of theirs
31 would have come off of roughly off BLM lands closer to home and
32 one off the Park Service land further to the east.

33

34 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: For some of the villages was it
35 because of the weather, or was it because there wasn't any
36 musk-oxen?

37

38 MR. ADKISSON: Well, you know, it's not like when the
39 caribou are in and people know there are caribou in the general
40 country and you can undertake a long journey and be assured of
41 finding a caribou, probably. Here you have to undertake a long
42 journey and you don't know often what you're going to find when
43 you get there. You may find musk-oxen, you may not find
44 musk-oxen. You may not find a legal bull. So it's not that
45 there's not maybe some musk-oxen, it's basically an issue of
46 being able to get to them. And that's compounded by the fact
47 that when they're pinned down because of weather or conditions
48 to travel, they can basically look out fairly close to home in
49 many cases and see animals. It's just that they're not able to
50 harvest them because they're on State or private lands.

00104

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes, Perry.

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: And that's why we moved it to August 1
4 start up, to March, because they would see them in August but
5 can't shoot them. That's why we moved it to August 1 till
6 March 15th in that area. That way you won't have to spend that
7 much gas when they do see them.

8

9 MR. ADKISSON: If there are no other questions on this
10 year's hunt, I'd like to turn to the Cooperators meeting that
11 we had in late January and developments since then.

12

13 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I have just one more. Could you
14 give us a copy of your summary or, I mean your -- what you read
15 off?

16

17 MR. ADKISSON: It's just a sheet of notes. I can write
18 something up for you or they could get it -- Fish and Wildlife
19 can probably give it to you.

20

21 MS. CROSS: It will be in the minutes.

22

23 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All right. Thank you.

24

25 MR. ADKISSON: I didn't have a whole lot of time to do
26 this because things were breaking pretty fast. You'll see in a
27 little bit all of the information that you got in the handouts
28 and things. Basically the material that you got as handouts
29 this morning is, you've got something with a cover letter from
30 the Department of Fish and Game that's stapled together.
31 That's basically about 10 pages and is a summary of the
32 Musk-oxen Cooperators' meeting in January, which contains the
33 tables of summary recommendations that came out of that meeting
34 that you can refer to, if you'd like. And it also includes
35 descriptions of three hunt options.

36

37 What the Cooperators identified in January was
38 essentially three basic hunt scenarios, what we call Option 1,
39 2 and 3. Option 1 was the status quo, or the Federal only hunt
40 that we have now. Option 2 was a State Tier I hunt with what's
41 called community bag limits. And there was a lot of excitement
42 at the Cooperators when that was first sort of unveiled.
43 Further discussions between the State folks and their Attorney
44 General's Office and so forth indicated that hopes were
45 probably misplaced regarding Option 2 and that it wasn't such a
46 good sounding option. And as things developed, that option has
47 basically just dropped out of the picture.

48

49 And then the third option was a combination Federal
50 hunt with a State managed Tier II hunt. So really any further

00105

1 discussions really focused on either the Federal hunt, which
2 we're all familiar with, or the Option 3 combination Federal
3 and State Tier II hunt. And I won't go into all of the things
4 that make up, you know, how the State operates and separates
5 out of Tier I and Tier II and stuff. Most of you may be
6 familiar with that, but if you do have questions, feel free to
7 ask and I'll try to do my best to answer them.

8
9 The Cooperators meeting in January was pretty well
10 represented by area villages. Johnson was there, as was
11 Clifford Weyionanna from Shishmaref, Toby Anungazuk from
12 Wales, Elmer Seetot from Brevig Mission, Buckland and Deering
13 were represented. The only hunt village that really wasn't
14 represented at the meeting was Teller. And there were
15 representatives from Golovin and White Mountain, and maybe one
16 or two other villages, at least part of the time.

17
18 And I might turn to some of the discussions there. The
19 table pretty well summarizes the outcome of the meeting. And
20 I'd like to focus not so much on details, but rather talk about
21 sort of general directions or things that emerged out of the
22 Cooperators meeting. And keep in mind that while I'm talking
23 about perhaps the majority of opinions and things, on occasion
24 on issues there were strong minority opinions. And I'll just
25 toss out an example. You heard Peter Buck this morning speak
26 about White Mountain and how they don't want musk-oxen.
27 Conversely though, Golovin was represented, another village in
28 22(B) and they felt they wanted to see the musk-oxen expand and
29 get closer to them where they could have an opportunity to hunt
30 them. So those are two sides of the issue.

31
32 And I'll just summarize and I will go over the table of
33 recommendations. By in large, the people at the Cooperators
34 meeting wanted to see the musk-oxen increase in numbers and
35 range. They wanted that coupled with an improved harvest
36 opportunity though. And most of them wanted to look at a
37 little more favorable or higher harvest rate, ranging between
38 three to five percent. Some of that difference reflects
39 people's experience with the animals.

40
41 Initially the people in southern 23, Buckland and
42 Deering, since they're on the western edge of the expansion,
43 wanted to keep the harvest a little lower. As you'll see later
44 when I talk about later developments, that's changed a little
45 bit. They also kind of felt that they wanted to manage
46 musk-oxen on a subunit by subunit basis, that it gave more
47 flexibility. There was a strong minority opinion however to
48 manage all the musk-oxen as one population and treat it, you
49 know, in terms of one hunt. But I think there's enough
50 difference in some of the desires and things in the village

00106

1 that subunit by subunit basis, which is the way we have been
2 managing it, is the way the State intended initially to manage
3 them, gives us a great deal more flexibility and allows us to
4 respond better to needs and situations of the villages in the
5 respective subunits.

6
7 The harvestable surplus, we don't have a lot of control
8 over that in a sense. Currently it's set at three percent of
9 the number of animals counted at the last count within the
10 subunit. However, that figure could go up or down, depending
11 upon the number of animals. But there's also recognition that
12 we could talk about changing the overall percentage or harvest
13 level. And, as you can see, there's some indication to raise
14 it. I'll have more to say about that a little bit later.

15
16 There's a section on there, a row of subsistence needs.
17 Folks in the villages had a really tough time trying to
18 identify their subsistence need level. And part of the reason
19 for that is that they really haven't had a long established
20 historical pattern of harvest to draw on. And they were
21 reluctant to identify a level that might be too low or
22 obviously outrageously high either. But most of them as
23 they've discussed the issue since the Co-op meeting have come
24 to some reasonable solutions to that question.

25
26 Of course the other question that was facing them was
27 how to divide up potentially permits between Federal and State
28 allocations. And you can see from the table that it varies by
29 subunit. We're getting a little closer to maybe a uniform, but
30 there is still some variation in that. And the season, there
31 was some discussion about that, but basically folks tended
32 towards the August 1st to March 15th season that you've already
33 acted on. And regarding the bag limit, essentially people felt
34 that a bulls-only hunt at this time was still appropriate but
35 they were interested in reconsidering the harvest somewhere
36 down the line and possibly having a cows hunt, including an
37 either sex hunt.

38
39 And that's basically it I think for the Cooperators
40 meeting. Do any of you have any questions about the late
41 January Cooperators meeting?

42
43 MR. KATCHATAG: I've heard the comments from the
44 previous meetings that the reason why some of those people up
45 there doesn't want musk-ox is because of the various
46 vegetation. When musk-ox goes in they notice that they eat
47 roots and all the berries. And a lot of people up there
48 depends on berries.

49
50 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. And part of that is I think a

00107

1 function of where those kinds or problems are occurring. One
2 of the things that we did later was ask folks about, do you
3 think this is too many musk-oxen or do you think they're too
4 man musk-oxen close to home. And generally the responses that
5 came back were, there's too many right close to home where we
6 go to pick berries. So they weren't concerned about the whole
7 Seward Peninsula and too many musk-oxen, they were concerned
8 that there were too many right close to home that were eating
9 the sour (indiscernible), trampling the berries, scaring the
10 old ladies that went out to pick berries and on, and on, and
11 on, you've heard that. And the unfortunate part of that
12 situation is the current Federal hunt will not allow them to
13 harvest animals where the problems are occurring. And 22(C)
14 and any of them really, I mean you can see it on the map, the
15 distribution of Federal land.

16
17 MR. MENDENHALL: And we're worried about the blackberry
18 patches. Even though they are thick, they're not getting what
19 they used to because of both the reindeer and the musk-ox.

20
21 MR. ADKISSON: Okay. Any other questions or comments
22 about the Cooperators meeting? Okay. One of the problems that
23 was there at the Cooperators meeting basically was is that
24 essentially each village was represented by one individual who
25 in many cases felt that they really weren't empowered to act on
26 behalf of the village at that point in time and commit the
27 village to a course of action. And in the case of Teller they
28 weren't represented at all. And so what the National Park
29 Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game basically
30 did following the Cooperators meeting was to set up a series of
31 teleconferences, and in one case another public meeting in
32 Teller that was attended by both people from Teller and Brevig
33 Mission, to talk about the Cooperators meeting, the outcome of
34 it and get increased input into the process from the village
35 organizations themselves.

36
37 And we just wrapped up a series of teleconferences and
38 one public meeting and I'll try to basically give you the
39 results of that. I think I can do that very quickly. And
40 you'll find all this material in your packets also. You'll
41 find summary notes from the audio conferences where we have
42 them available and eventually you'll get to a series of
43 resolutions that some of the organizations passed. The Teller
44 audio conferences initially was they wanted Option 1 or a
45 Federal-only hunt.

46
47 They basically were very reluctant to try a State-
48 managed hunt. They had very little faith that it would work in
49 their favor, even though they were aware of the problems
50 associated with that Federal hunt. And they felt that four or

00108

1 five percent harvest was appropriate. There were some other
2 questions that the State was asking them to address, such as
3 one of the State proposals will be to perhaps modify the tag
4 fee associated with the State hunt. So the State was asking
5 them, what do you want to do with the tag fee? And basically
6 most of the villages, in fact, all of them I think just want to
7 do away with the tag fee. So that was another question.

8
9 They felt subunits were fine. By and large they wanted
10 to see the herd continue to grow and expand, but again coupled
11 with more opportunities. And by and large the audio
12 conferences produced fairly similar results. However, some of
13 the other villages were more willing to basically buy into a
14 joint State hunt. And when we wrapped it all up, I think
15 basically the harvest rates went up generally from four percent
16 to six percent. Shishmaref felt a six percent harvest level
17 would be appropriate.

18
19 Subsistence needs, most of the villages began to settle
20 into sort of a formula. For example, Wales thought based on
21 their experience one animal per every four households in the
22 community was an appropriate expression of their level of need.
23 At the most recent conference that we had with Deering and
24 Buckland, Deering's logic went, well the most we've ever really
25 taken have been four or five and when we shared those and
26 distributed around it went pretty quickly. So we think we
27 could probably use two or three more. Buckland weighed in and
28 said that sounds reasonable. We're a little bigger village so
29 we think we ought to have more. Deering said about seven or
30 eight and Buckland said about nine as an expression of their
31 need.

32
33 And on and on it went. So basically some of the other
34 villages thought it ought to be a percentage of the population
35 of the community that be used to determine it. You'll see some
36 figures down at the bottom of the Cooperators' table that we
37 came up with some initial totals. Like total 25 to 35, 26, 28
38 to 29, 79 to 90, total for the whole Peninsula thing. And, you
39 know, those figures really don't matter that much. What does
40 matter is, is that whatever people are coming up with, the
41 level of identified need is larger than the available allowable
42 harvest. And that automatically throws the State into a Tier
43 II management scheme where clearly you don't have enough
44 animals to satisfy subsistence needs.

45
46 So once your subsistence need crosses a threshold,
47 after that it really doesn't matter whether it keeps going or
48 not because you've only got a certain allowable harvest and
49 clearly it's not enough to meet the subsistence need. So the
50 State is really looking and going to have to be forced to deal

00109

1 with a Tier II hunt. As result of the audio conferences that
2 we had regarding Federal and State hunt, all six hunt villages
3 now basically support Option 3. They support a mixed Federal
4 hunt with the State Tier II hunt.

5
6 Villages in Subunits 22(D) and (E) favor a 50-50 split
7 in permits, half the permits going to a Federal hunt and half
8 of the permits going to the State hunt. However in southern
9 (23) for Buckland and Deering, they want a different approach
10 and they want 75 percent of the permits to go to the Federal
11 hunt and 25 percent to go to the State hunt. And you can see
12 on your Cooperators' meeting summary, you can see even then
13 that they had kind of a sliding scale with a little more
14 tendency to favor the Federal hunt.

15
16 All of the villages in the polls and so forth that we
17 talked to, the six villages want to see the herds expand in
18 numbers and range, but they do want higher harvest levels.
19 Those harvest levels are now basically between four and six
20 percent as I've indicated. They want a fairly simple hunt if
21 they can get it without a lot of bureaucratic hassles, they
22 want to be able to hunt closer to home where they can hunt more
23 safely and efficiently. And above all, they want to make sure
24 that there are musk-oxen out there for their grandchildren to
25 hunt. So the villages are concerned about, you know,
26 conserving the animals in a sense and looking at them as a
27 renewable resource that is going to be around for a long time
28 and becomes integrated into their subsistence economy.

29
30 The other thing that you'll find there -- maybe I
31 should say is there any questions at this point about the audio
32 conferences?

33
34 MR. MENDENHALL: I thought they had input, but the
35 problem they had was trying to have them where people weren't
36 always around.

37
38 MR. ADKISSON: The audio conference that Grace and
39 Perry were part of was the one that we had late last week with
40 Buckland and Deering. And they followed that up. They took
41 the materials, listened to what we had to say, gave us some
42 feedback and then the two villages set up a meeting Monday to
43 go over it again. And I mentioned one or two points from that.
44 But I got this from Jim Dow of ADF&G via telephone late last
45 night, and I also have a fax from Fred regarding the resolution
46 that Deering passed.

47
48 And basically Buckland and Deering want to go with the
49 Option 3, they want a five percent harvest right now. They
50 felt that if they could take animals off the full range of the

00110

1 area, they felt a five percent level was appropriate. I've
2 already mentioned they want 75 percent of the permits to go to
3 the Federal hunt, 25 percent to the State. And I mentioned how
4 they arrived at their subsistence need level.

5
6 What this brings us then to is what perhaps the next
7 step is that you folks need to be considering. And you'll also
8 see in your packet a little thing marked draft, draft, draft
9 all over it, which I basically wrote up. And it was to get you
10 folks perhaps thinking towards and some things to consider and
11 if you want to formulate a resolution. And we fed that around
12 to all of the villages and Kawerak, and we've got formal
13 resolutions back from all of the hunt villages and Kawerak,
14 basically endorsing this resolution and this approach. And
15 what I would ask you folks to do is consider this and perhaps
16 try to form a resolution at this meeting that we could then
17 present to the State Board of Game and to the Federal
18 Subsistence Board.

19
20 And maybe we could turn to the draft if you want now.
21 Some of the materials in your packet, there's sample letters
22 from Teller and some of the other material that you've got are
23 the most recent expressions. These are all copies of the
24 endorsement letters and resolutions that have been passed by
25 the villages.

26
27 MR. MENDENHALL: You recommended three percent or five
28 percent?

29
30 MR. ADKISSON: We're not recommending anything at this
31 time. I think that's one of the factors that we want to keep
32 open to negotiate with the State. I can tell you though what I
33 have basically told people. What I've been telling the
34 villages and I've been telling the State and other folks, is
35 that what we know of the population now, I think there wouldn't
36 be any problem with four percent. I really think five percent
37 would work. I think six percent's more questionable. I also
38 would recommend that any increase in harvest level be tied to a
39 State hunt. In other words, to make the harvest level go up
40 now at this time, we need to tie that with the ability of
41 people to hunt across a broader spectrum of land and have
42 access to more animals.

43
44 In other words, spread the hunt impacts out. And if we
45 could do that, I have absolutely no problem with four percent.
46 I would support five percent. I'd really want to look at six
47 percent, though, I think there are some other problems with
48 that and it may not be very supportable right at this time.
49 But, again, these things can be subject to change down the
50 road. So I mean here is an opportunity I think to raise the

00111

1 harvest level moderately right almost immediately, as soon as
2 we get a State hunt in place. There are still concerns,
3 especially in 22(D) about the impacts of the current harvest
4 regime, the way we base the harvest level on the total number
5 of animals within the subunit and then apply that down to the
6 much smaller amount of Federal land.

7
8 We face Requests for Reconsideration, RFR challenges
9 each year from the State. All indications are that that's not
10 going to go away. Therefore, if we don't get a State hunt I
11 would be reluctant to initially move off the three percent
12 formula. But I think from what we also know, I think we could
13 down the road, individually, by subunit, by subunit talk about
14 raising the level like to four or five, even if it just
15 occurred on Federal land. So I think we're looking down the
16 road in the short range, we're looking at raising the harvest
17 levels. But I don't think we need to put it into the
18 resolution. I think that's something that we need to work out
19 in cooperation with the villages and with the State.

20
21 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, I'm not allowed to hunt on
22 22(C), so you guys in that category, what the resolutions
23 reflect is five percent. Because they're not getting them all.
24 That's why I'm making that statement. Zero, zero, zero, not
25 one, not.....

26
27 MS. CROSS: The villages are you said between three to
28 six percent, right?

29
30 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. But the latest round of audio
31 conferences produced figures of five percent and six percent,
32 essentially. And I think that's reasonable if we can hunt
33 across the whole range, at least five percent.

34
35 MR. MENDENHALL: I think Peter is leaving a moment.

36
37 MS. CROSS: He's gone long time. If I didn't
38 misunderstand you, there are no more villages that wish to
39 remain with Federal hunt only?

40
41 MR. ADKISSON: That's correct. But we didn't know
42 that. As you'll recall at the time when we had the audio
43 conference with Deering and Buckland, they were reluctant to
44 move off the Federal-only hunt. And your comment to them was
45 you would support their decision. And what I wanted this
46 resolution to do was to give you folks the flexibility to let
47 the villages know that you supported their decision, regardless
48 of what that decision was. And that's the way this was
49 written. But, yes, in effect, all six villages now want to go
50 with the combination State and Federal hunt. It doesn't hurt

00112

1 to leave that in there just as a backup.

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah. For the simple reason that 23
4 is outside 22 itself, I would make a motion to support the
5 decisions made in the 23 Deering/Buckland as whatever they came
6 up with.

7

8 MR. ADKISSON: Right. And the Northwest Arctic.....

9

10 MR. MENDENHALL: That's my motion.

11

12 MR. ADKISSON: And the Northwest Arctic RAC has not had
13 an opportunity to see this. Although Percy Ballot who is on
14 the RAC was at the latest round of meetings that involved ADF&G
15 and the two combined villages of Buckland and Deering. I think
16 with all of this there's really two important things to do.
17 One is to send a very clear message to the State Board of Game
18 that the Federal system is flexible and willing to work with
19 them. And the second important thing to do is to send a
20 message to those six villages that the Federal system will
21 support them and protect their interests, their Federal
22 interests and subsistence priority, we're not going to sell
23 them down the drain.

24

25 MR. MENDENHALL: Anyway, that's my motion for 23, to
26 support whatever they came up with for musk-ox.

27

28 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: There's a motion by Perry. Do I
29 hear a second.

30

31 MR. ENINGOWUK: I second the motion.

32

33 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Seconded by Johnson.

34

35 MR. MENDENHALL: Call for question. I mean I say
36 question.

37

38 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question's been called. All in
39 favor say aye.

40

41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42

43 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Those opposed, no.

44

45 (No opposing responses)

46

47 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: For your information, Peter, the
48 motion was to support the five villages, Buckland, Deering.....

49

50 MR. MENDENHALL: No, just for 23 right now.

00113

1 MR. ADKISSON: And 22.

2
3 MR. MENDENHALL: And 22.

4
5 MR. ADKISSON: The four villages in 22, Shishmaref,
6 Wales, Brevig and Teller.

7
8 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, my motion was 23, but you want
9 to include the others. Okay. That's all right.

10
11 MS. CROSS: Your motion was for 22.

12
13 MR. MENDENHALL: 23.

14
15 MR. BUCK: I was listening to the teleconference a
16 while ago when Ken Adkisson was speaking. And then I was going
17 to say something but I couldn't get through. But the Chairman
18 was talking about the Federal and State allocations for the
19 musk-oxen, he was talking about taking four and six percent.
20 Even though there is not very many musk-oxen in White Mountain,
21 Golovin, Elim area, if they do wander in that area and then we
22 take them, wouldn't that be considered part of between four and
23 six percent of the whole Seward Peninsula and be able to take
24 those musk-ox?

25
26 MR. ADKISSON: Peter, the way the things would work is
27 that when the formula comes out of the State and the Federal
28 systems, hopefully it would still be based on subunit by
29 subunit basis with a harvest level that will be established at
30 a percentage basis of the population of animals within those
31 subunits. And if we stick with managing on a subunit basis, it
32 could vary and differ from subunit to subunit to reflect the
33 individual needs and concerns of the villages within that.
34 Right now there is no hunt in 22(B). So in a sense that's a
35 moot point unless the State enacts a hunt in 22(B). If that
36 would happen, then it would be like four to six percent perhaps
37 of the animals counted within the subunit of 22(B).

38
39 But the Council this morning, the RAC here basically
40 rejected the proposal from Mark McAlister to establish a
41 Federal season and bag in 22(B), simply because at the count
42 just completed there were no animals identified on Federal
43 public lands. So if there is a hunt at all in 22(B) it'll have
44 to come out of the State side of the system for now and would
45 depend on whatever formula is kind of established. And that's
46 why we haven't really asked in the resolution to have any
47 specific, you know, figures in there. What we need to do is be
48 able to work with the Board of Game and work with the villages
49 in the area and the Fish and Game Advisory Councils and so
50 forth to work out a commonly accepted formula.

00114

1 MR. BUCK: Okay. I just wanted to clarify it. That's
2 the two things I was thinking about, whether we're going by
3 subunit or we're going by the whole Seward Peninsula in
4 figuring between four and six percent of the amount taken.
5 Because since this area don't want the musk-ox in that area.
6 And if they do want them in that area then I was wondering if
7 that could be considered as the -- it became four and six
8 percent of the whole Seward Peninsula population.

9
10 MR. ADKISSON: Well, I don't think so at this stage,
11 Peter, and I'll tell you why. As I indicated earlier, there is
12 a minority opinion, a somewhat strong minority opinion that the
13 Peninsula musk-oxen population should be managed as a single
14 biological entity with one hunt formula and so forth. But by
15 and large that's not the message that's coming out of the
16 cooperators' meeting or the village conferences we held since.
17 I would have to say that the majority of folks that have had
18 input would prefer to continue to manage on a subunit by
19 subunit basis, so I -- you know, my guess is that the Board of
20 Game will probably try to adhere to that and, you know, I would
21 assume that the Federal Subsistence Board would then continue
22 to do the same. And I think that's what will eventually be
23 reflected through the cooperators, but, you know, you're
24 probably not talking about a really large change in the number
25 of harvestable animals.

26
27 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I have a question for Helen or Mr.
28 Court Recorder. What was that motion from Perry earlier?
29 We're kind of confused.

30
31 MR. MENDENHALL: They got mixed messages.

32
33 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Was the motion for Unit 23 or was
34 it.....

35
36 MS. ARMSTRONG: What I wrote down was to support the
37 recommendations for Unit 23.

38
39 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: For what?

40
41 MS. ARMSTRONG: Unit 23.

42
43 MR. MENDENHALL: 23, right.

44
45 MS. ARMSTRONG: I understood that you were then
46 correcting it?

47
48 MR. MENDENHALL: No, it was 23, to show support for
49 Unit 23 because separate numbers. You got to keep the numbers
50 separate in each motion when they get waylaid, that's why I

00115

1 mentioned at this time Unit 23 for to acknowledge their wishes
2 in 23 for both Deering and Buckland. That was my motion to
3 support that right now. Then later we would do 22 as a --
4 because it's another unit.

5
6 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair.

7
8 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes, Mr. Adkisson.

9
10 MR. ADKISSON: One of the reasons this draft resolution
11 was written the way it was, was so that we could have one
12 strong resolution, let's say, to the State Board of Game, but
13 still have all the flexibility and protection built in to allow
14 us to go around and maneuver with individual subunits and
15 villages that wanted to take a different tack, because I
16 thought that would be more effective, let's say, than trying to
17 submit a series of resolutions or whatever.

18
19 MR. MENDENHALL: That's your recommendation, then, to
20 just to do all one resolution just for 23 and 22?

21
22 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah, and I think you can see if you go
23 through your packets of this material, you can pretty much see
24 what the villages' response was, they -- in many cases they
25 adopted this almost verbatim. In other cases, they sort of
26 retailored it to fit their resolution format. And probably the
27 only one that really differs significantly was Brevig and there
28 were some people in Brevig that wanted to go entirely with the
29 State hunt and so you'll see a little less give and take in
30 theirs for the Federal portion, but.....

31
32 MR. MENDENHALL: But the fact that Deering and Buckland
33 were sister cities and they're in Unit 23 we would show from
34 this part strong support for them outside 22.

35
36 MR. ADKISSON: Okay.

37
38 MR. MENDENHALL: That's still for 23 supporting that.
39 And then come back to 22 and do it. Then it shows -- then you
40 have double ammunition that this is still coming from this
41 draft committee. That's the way I look at, but if you want us
42 to combine it.....

43
44 MR. ADKISSON: It's your -- really thing, I just made
45 that as a point of discussion and.....

46
47 MR. MENDENHALL: I think I'll go along with whatever
48 you -- I mean I would vote for whatever recommendation you come
49 forth with.

50

00116

1 MR. ADKISSON: I just think it's important that -- you
2 know, what you might want to do if you wanted to have one
3 resolution, you know, you could amend something like this to
4 indicate that, you know, Unit 23 is outside of your
5 jurisdiction but, you know, you want to express strong support
6 for whatever direction they want to take, and that can be
7 incorporated in one thing. I just think it would be more
8 simpler to go to the State Board of Game with a single, you
9 know, inclusive statement.

10
11 MR. MENDENHALL: They get confused with numbers and
12 subunits and everything else.

13
14 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah, that's why I avoid all that.

15
16 MR. MENDENHALL: That's why I'm saying 23 Unit
17 separate, but if you want to combine them.....

18
19 MR. ADKISSON: Maybe we can present two of them to the
20 Board, too.

21
22 MR. KATCHATAG: I don't think we can combine anything.
23 Like now we got told how many, we can't decide for them, they
24 got to be on the meeting.

25
26 MR. MENDENHALL: They had their village meeting
27 already, we're just reacting to that -- documents of the
28 village meetings. But it's up to Johnson here, you've got most
29 of the musk-ox, five out of six, what you think?

30
31 MR. ENINGOWUK: Well, even -- because it's the Seward
32 Peninsula it does include Unit 22 and 23. I don't see why --
33 we just combine the two, it's the Seward Peninsula.

34
35 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, make your motion then.

36
37 MS. CROSS: And then you better take back your original
38 motion (indiscernible).....

39
40 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: You want to withdraw your motion.

41
42 MS. CROSS: For lack of second.

43
44 MR. MENDENHALL: I withdraw my motion if you're going
45 to combine one resolution.

46
47 MS. CROSS: It probably died for lack of second anyway.
48 Nobody seconded your motion.

49
50 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay.

00117

1 MS. CROSS: It died of lack of second.

2

3 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We cannot make any resolutions or
4 vote on some issues without.....

5

6 MS. CROSS: We got a quorum already.

7

8 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We need to -- as a Board we need to
9 stay away from these confusions. We need to stick together
10 and.....

11

12 MR. MENDENHALL: That's what we're doing, we're trying
13 to combine them now.

14

15 MR. KATCHATAG: Point of order. Do we have a motion?

16

17 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion that the Seward Pen
18 RAC Committee supports staff on the strong resolution for musk-
19 ox hunt for both State and Federal lands if they are to be
20 done. And I put the term five percent out there for simple
21 reason is that they haven't fulfilled all their hunts even at
22 the present level.

23

24 MR. KATCHATAG: Is that motion in order, Mr. Adkisson?

25

26 MR. ADKISSON: Well, I think so, yeah, you just keep in
27 mind that, you know, that whatever we take or whatever you send
28 to the State Board of Game then is subject to their process and
29 everything they go through and, you know, I can't tell you how
30 they're going to wind up setting their formulas or whatever so,
31 yeah, I think it's very appropriate. And I'll give you an
32 example of this, but Shishmaref wanted six percent and
33 basically, you know, I'm talking with Shishmaref, we encouraged
34 them, because ADF&G wanted villages to respond directly,
35 individually, to the Board of Game and we encouraged Shishmaref
36 to submit that six percent figure. I personally don't think
37 it's probably going to succeed but, you know, it doesn't hurt
38 to ask.

39

40 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Is there a second to that motion?

41

42 MR. BUCK: I'll second Perry's motion, this is Peter
43 Buck.

44

45 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Second by Peter. Call for
46 question.

47

48 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, discussion.

49

50 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Or discussion.

00118

1 MR. MENDENHALL: You want us to go by each village by
2 village or you want us just to say five percent rate? Because
3 you know, based on what you said before, they were given
4 numbers but they never fulfilled their hunt, regardless of five
5 percent, I mean whatever percent they had -- were given.

6
7 MR. ADKISSON: Well, I think, you know, the
8 cooperators, really, are going to be the ones that eventually
9 probably make the strongest case for whatever recommending --
10 whatever harvest level actually come, because eventually what
11 we're going to have to do is we're going to have to play a game
12 of sort of catch up and based on the cooperators' meeting and
13 all this input, we're going to have to go back and we're going
14 to have to revise the Cooperative Management Plan to fit, you
15 know, reality. And we'll probably make some recommendations on
16 harvest levels based biological things, in other words.

17
18 And what I can just tell you is what I'm saying is, is
19 that from what we know of the population now and out there,
20 there's no reason why we still could not achieve the objective
21 of growth and expansion while allowing for a moderately
22 increased harvest level. What that harvest level is, I don't
23 know, is it four percent, five percent, six percent? My own
24 feeling is that if we want growth and expansion, we want a
25 little more time under our belts to observe what's going on in
26 the trends with the animals. I don't think there's any reason
27 to not accept four, I think five is reasonable. I feel
28 uncomfortable with six but it doesn't mean that somebody might
29 not convince the State Board of Game that six would acceptable.

30
31 But the other thing we have to do is when we start
32 talking harvest levels like, too, you know, there's BLM to be
33 considered, you know there are other folks involved in that,
34 too.

35
36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any further discussion?

37
38 MS. CROSS: Wait, wait. See the group recommend
39 harvest not to exceed five percent, but their range was still
40 from three to five percent harvest.

41
42 MR. ADKISSON: Let me, maybe, explain that, Grace. At
43 the cooperators' meeting we divide up basically into four
44 groups, each subunit group, and then we have a group what we
45 call the holistic group where they were supposed to look at
46 things.....

47
48 MS. CROSS: Holistically.

49
50 MR. ADKISSON:as a group. Yeah, take the whole

00119

1 Peninsula into consideration, but what they were supposed to
2 do, they were supposed to be charged with making sure they
3 considered the opinions and things of the subgroup, in a way,
4 and so what you see there is kind of a reflection of that.
5 They came up with about a five, but the other groups, as you
6 see, had more specific and generally lower. But all the groups
7 now are essentially talking five percent with the exception of
8 Shishmaref which is saying six percent.

9
10 MR. KATCHATAG: What do you mean when you say
11 subgroups? What are they?

12
13 MR. ADKISSON: The communities within the current hunt
14 area. That would be the communities of Shishmaref and Wales in
15 22(E), Brevig Mission and Teller in 22(D) and the communities
16 of Buckland and Deering in 23. The six federally eligible
17 villages.

18
19 MR. KATCHATAG: Who sponsored this.....

20
21 MR. MENDENHALL: The cooperators.

22
23 MR. KATCHATAG:these groups that you're talking
24 about?

25
26 MR. ADKISSON: There really isn't a sponsor to it,
27 Fred, it's -- what the coop.....

28
29 MR. KATCHATAG: I just wondering, how did it come to
30 be?

31
32 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We started it, we formed it.

33
34 MR. KATCHATAG: Oh.

35
36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: The Council established that --
37 those villages to start hunting musk-ox, so we're the
38 instigators.

39
40 MR. KATCHATAG: Oh, okay.

41
42 MR. MENDENHALL: We're just doing our job.

43
44 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay, any further discussion?

45
46 MS. CROSS: Where did you want to stick this five
47 percent? It seem to varied.....

48
49 MR. MENDENHALL: It's from here and then some of their
50 resolutions that came in this March 16 -- dated March 16th, it

00120

1 went as high up as six percent, three, five, four. And then
2 here. And then looking at the numbers they gave us with their
3 hunts, they still haven't achieved that. Even that five
4 percent is still over achievement. So that's why that's five
5 percent and then staff recommends that -- he's satisfied with
6 five percent.

7
8 MR. ADKISSON: I think that sellable.

9
10 MS. CROSS: Okay, you're talking about combined State
11 in there, okay.

12
13 MR. ENINGOWUK: Mr. Chair.

14
15 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes.

16
17 MR. ENINGOWUK: I'd like to add Shishmaref shows six
18 percent because at the current harvest rate we'll make a dent
19 on the musk-ox population. In fact, the musk-ox population at
20 the current level is still growing and will continue to grow.
21 Even if we say that there's going to be too much musk-oxen up
22 in our country that it will still grow, even at a six percent
23 harvest. They don't have any natural enemies, like bear or any
24 of the -- and they seem to be a healthy group that we believe
25 that even at six percent that the population of musk-oxen will
26 still grown.

27
28 And that the community of Shishmaref, I think, wanted
29 to maintain that the musk-oxen is healthy and it's going to
30 outgrow itself and then if we let it outgrow itself and let it
31 get too big then it's going to destroy itself because of
32 competition of grazing between reindeer and grazing from musk-
33 oxen, that the Peninsula couldn't take the overgrazing. That's
34 how we felt, of course, Ken may disagree with us or -- comment?

35
36 MR. ADKISSON: No, Johnson, I don't disagree with that
37 and I think that's a good point. The problem I think the
38 biologists are having is that there's no real hard and fast way
39 right now that they can say -- let's say your objectives for
40 musk-oxen management are you want a lot of growth and
41 expansion, you want a little bit of growth, you want not growth
42 or you want the numbers to go lower, decrease. The problem
43 right now is that the biologists don't have a hard and fast set
44 of harvest percentages that you could apply to ensure that any
45 of those scenarios is going to happen, so it's kind of -- the
46 feeling is, let's move slowly, let's try like four or five
47 percent, watch it for a couple of years. If the population
48 continues to grow -- and this is what came out at the
49 cooperators' meeting also, and I believe Shishmaref was one of
50 the key ones that wanted a sliding harvest level, so that after

00121

1 a couple, three years we could look at it and say, oh, well,
2 five percent doesn't seem to be slowing them down much, we got
3 more musk-oxen then we had before we went to five, let's
4 consider six or seven. And then I think the cooperators would
5 come back and deal with that.

6
7 MR. MENDENHALL: This is just for '99, correct?

8
9 MR. ADKISSON: Right. And I think everybody's willing,
10 like I said, my discussions with ADF&G is that they would be
11 willing to buy into five percent, assuming it was, you know,
12 coupled with the State hunt, and I think I can say that
13 federally.

14
15 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Does everyone agree with that?

16
17 (No audible responses)

18
19 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Well, if that's the case I will
20 call for question.

21
22 MR. MENDENHALL: Question.

23
24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question's been called. All in
25 favor say aye.

26
27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28
29 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Those opposed, no.

30
31 (No opposing responses)

32
33 MR. ADKISSON: I guess the only remaining thing to do
34 is if you folks can put some sort of formal resolution together
35 and perhaps, you know, get staff to work it up and have it by
36 the end of the meeting.

37
38 The other thing that might be helpful, I mentioned this
39 to Tom Boyd, is that if someone from the Regional Advisory
40 Council could go to the Board of Game meetings next week, I
41 think it would help. It would be a good show of good faith on
42 the Federal system's part and they could present the
43 resolution. If that's unable to happen, I'm going to go to the
44 State Board of Game meeting and I would be glad to present the
45 resolution, but I think it would be more appropriate if it came
46 from the Regional Advisory Council.

47
48 MR. EDENSHAW: And also, Mr. Chairman.

49
50 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes.

00122

1 MR. EDENSHAW: That's starts on the 21st and I was
2 talking with Greg Boz, the liaison in our office, they would
3 likely do the proposal -- well, address musk-ox on Monday.

4
5 MR. ADKISSON: Which would be, what, the 23rd or
6 something, Cliff?

7
8 MR. EDENSHAW: Yeah.

9
10 MR. ADKISSON: And the other thing I'm not really sure
11 about with the Federal system -- or the State system is exactly
12 -- sometimes they have, like, a sign-up period and you have a
13 day and a half in which -- from the beginning in which you have
14 to sign up if you want to testify, and it's not real clear
15 whether all of this stuff would get into the system via direct
16 public testimony or whether it might be worked out through
17 working groups or whatever. So there's a lot of, you know,
18 questions still surrounding it and I think we need to have --
19 get it in however we get it.

20
21 MS. CROSS: I was going to.....

22
23 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, right now that's right where you
24 are.

25
26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Let's go to Ken's recommendation to
27 draft a resolution and from there we can pick one our members
28 to submit a proposal or resolution.

29
30 MS. CROSS: If there's going to be a fare, who.....

31
32 MR. EDENSHAW: Probably considering -- I mean since
33 it's from the Council recommendation or want one of you to
34 attend the Board of Game meeting in Fairbanks, then that would
35 be taken into consideration, by Tom.

36
37 MR. BOYD: We would cover the costs.

38
39 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: The Chair will entertain a motion
40 to draft a resolution or pass a resolution.

41
42 MS. CROSS: We just did. I think we already done that.

43
44 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Do we have a resolution?

45
46 MS. CROSS: I mean we -- Perry, you moved to support
47 this paper and we just need to make it writing. That's all,
48 right?

49
50 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I think it would be better if we

00123

1 just go ahead and pass the resolution.

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: It takes time to write it though.

4

5 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Cliff, do we have any problem
6 drafting a resolution to support, for a Council member to
7 submit to State Board of Game?

8

9 MR. EDENSHAW: It wouldn't be a problem doing the
10 resolution, no. I can -- it can be either that or else at the
11 office we could draft up a formal letter that the Council
12 member could read regarding information that Ken has passed
13 along.

14

15 MR. MENDENHALL: Do you want this resolution to include
16 this as addendum to the resolution?

17

18 MR. ADKISSON: I'm sorry, Perry, what do you mean by
19 that?

20

21 MR. MENDENHALL: The resolutions from the six villages
22 and they're IRA Tribal to be an addendum to that because that
23 would be appropriate and I'm asking.....

24

25 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah, you could, it's.....

26

27 MR. MENDENHALL:and, therefore, you could
28 probably do one WHEREAS for each village, WHEREAS Brevig
29 Mission, dah, dah, dah, has a resolution dated, dah, and these
30 are subsistence -- I mean these following villages, then each
31 one could be addressed. And then at the end say five percent
32 with a joint State and Federal musk-ox hunt; is that correct,
33 as THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED?

34

35 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah.

36

37 MR. MENDENHALL: And then Federal (indiscernible)
38 Committee, real quick on.....

39

40 MR. ADKISSON: And if you want I got a couple of more
41 that just came in, like, I think the one in your packet was
42 like maybe from the Native corporation in Shishmaref or
43 something, but I now have one from the Traditional Council, I
44 think, and the city, too, so I mean it's -- I mean these things
45 are going to continue to roll in and in some way, either I'll
46 assemble them and take them all with me to Fairbanks. ADF&G may
47 bundle them up and take them, you know. Heck, what the heck,
48 the more the merrier.

49

50 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I have a question, Ken. Should we

00124

1 go ahead and pass a resolution from this Council, then, to --
2 do we need that?

3

4 MR. ADKISSON: Oh, I think so. I think -- like I said,
5 I think it's important that there's a message conveyed to the
6 State Board of Game that you folks, you know, support the
7 efforts of the village to work through these problems of dual
8 management and recognize that the Federal hunt has problems and
9 that the Federal system is flexible and willing to work with
10 the State. At the same time you are going to protect the
11 federally protected interest of those villages.

12

13 And the villages need to know that, too, because, you
14 know, frankly they see this effort as trying to work with the
15 State as sort of a high risk factor. They're very concerned
16 that if they give -- yield or give up, and I think they see it
17 as give up, any of their Federal permits to the State for a
18 State hunt that they'll never see them come -- that they'll
19 never get them, that all those permits will go to people in
20 Nome and Glennallen or gosh knows where and that they're never
21 going to see any of them. And once they give them up they're
22 never going to have a chance at getting them back and.....

23

24 MR. MENDENHALL: Do you want this to be quota for only
25 1998-99 hunt only?

26

27 MR. ADKISSON: Well, let me explain, maybe, very
28 quickly explain the process.

29

30 MR. MENDENHALL: I'm trying to just put a limit on this
31 resolution because.....

32

33 MR. ADKISSON: Just leave it open because here's what's
34 going to happen. The ball will clearly be in the State's
35 court. The Board of Fish and Game will do something. Once
36 they've done that then you folks and the villages will have to
37 look at that action and say, do you agree with it? Is this a
38 good thing? Is this going to work for the villages? At that
39 point, if the answer is no, then the Federal system will do
40 nothing and we'll still stay with the status quo. Whether the
41 State will wind up with anything or not is problematical. You
42 know, we're going to still stay out with our 23 or 24 permits.
43 And my guess is the State will have to do the same unless it
44 want's to jack the harvest quotas up and have a hunt on their
45 own, which I don't think was really in spirit of the
46 cooperators.

47

48 If the answer comes back, yes, the State, in good
49 faith, has made an effort to, you know, address the needs of
50 the villages and so forth as best it could and the village are

00125

1 willing to try it, then it would be up to the Federal side of
2 the system to produce a Special Action so that we could get the
3 Federal system in line with the State. Then a Special Action
4 would only be good for, like, one year and then we would have
5 to -- the next cycle of proposals we would have to come in with
6 a proposal for a permanent regulation change. And that would
7 have to go through the regular Council, public input process
8 and Federal Subsistence Board action.

9
10 And I think Tom Boyd was mentioning to me, he thought
11 it might take actually two years for this thing to sort itself
12 out. The Special Action is only good for one year, so if we
13 try the State hunt and it bombs and the villages come back
14 screaming, it didn't work, it didn't work, then we just don't
15 renew the Special Action and it dies at the end of the first
16 hunt year and we're back with the Federal only hunt. So I
17 don't think you really have to do much at all. And the least
18 we do and the least we scare folks, the better.

19
20 MR. MENDENHALL: So you will draft up the resolution to
21 suit your own need, okay.

22
23 MR. ADKISSON: Well, you mean for this thing? Well, I
24 was hoping you guys could do it, there's -- but that's.....

25
26 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay.

27
28 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I'll entertain a motion.....

29
30 MR. BOYD: Just for clarity, I think if you tell us
31 what you want in the resolution we will capture it.

32
33 MR. MENDENHALL: Want time limit of.....

34
35 MR. BOYD: And I think you've already done that.

36
37 MR. MENDENHALL: We want a time limit for '98-99, five
38 percent combination State and Federal musk-ox hunt for these
39 six villages, that's all.

40
41 MR. BOYD: Okay.

42
43 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that 50/50?

44
45 MR. ENINGOWUK: 50/50, is that what the village.....

46
47 MR. ADKISSON: Well, don't start doing that in a way
48 because Deering and Buckland are very specific, they want 75
49 percent of the permits to go to the Federal side of the thing
50 and 25 percent to go to the State, so, you know, be careful of

00126

1 what you're saying. And that's why I kind of avoided -- what I
2 said was, in the resolution I said.....

3

4 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: A combination hunt.

5

6 MR. ADKISSON:the Regional Advisory Council
7 supports the concept of a mixed -- you know, combination hunt.
8 In order to have a combination hunt the -- we recognize that
9 the villages are going to have to give up some of their Federal
10 permits, but that number is unspecified and left up to be
11 determined through the cooperation of the individual villages.

12

13 MR. MENDENHALL: That is why I wanted that 23 Unit,
14 different than 22 because you got that 75 percent, 25
15 acknowledged between those two. Totally different than 22.

16

17 MR. ADKISSON: Sure, uh-huh.

18

19 MR. MENDENHALL: That's why I wanted two motions.

20

21 MR. ADKISSON: Well, that's fine if you want to
22 reconsider or do something.....

23

24 (Indiscernible - multiple voices)

25

26 MR. MENDENHALL: We already done that but -- we already
27 passed it to acknowledge the village desires.

28

29 MR. ADKISSON: You could build it in or whatever, too.

30

31 MR. MENDENHALL: That way, see, we fighting over the
32 numbers again. So that's what we want. And that Deering and
33 Buckland will be acknowledged as a 75/25 percent, that's.....

34

35 MS. CROSS: It seems to me that instead of arguing what
36 we're going to put in the wording, we should have one ready by
37 tomorrow to fax it to everybody.

38

39 MR. ENINGOWUK: Mr. Chairman.

40

41 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yeah.

42

43 MR. ENINGOWUK: I like the idea that the current
44 harvest is not really meeting the subsistence needs of the
45 communities, so I would like that point to be in the
46 resolution.

47

48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: And we're talking two resolutions?

49

50 MR. ENINGOWUK: No.

00127

1 MS. CROSS: No, because we're talking about three
2 percent or five percent. That would be something that we put
3 in when we're -- you know, that we're supporting five percent
4 in lieu of the current three percent.

5
6 MR. MENDENHALL: Overall.

7
8 MS. CROSS: Uh-huh.

9
10 MR. MENDENHALL: But what is the -- therefore, Unit 23
11 desires 75 percent Federal and 25 percent State, therefore,
12 Unit 22 (D) and (E) want -- still that five percent, State and
13 Federal, but no percentage breakdown.

14
15 MR. ENINGOWUK: I was just thinking that they were
16 looking for information (indiscernible) resolution that come
17 from us and I think you were just asking for some of the things
18 that might need to be included.

19
20 MR. MENDENHALL: Uh-huh. Yeah, that subsistence --
21 what was that, the subsistence?

22
23 MR. ENINGOWUK: That the current harvest levels is not
24 really meeting the needs of those communities.

25
26 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, therefore, we resolve WHEREAS
27 current subsistence harvest has not really been meeting the
28 needs of the villages.

29
30 MR. ENINGOWUK: Or something like that.

31
32 MR. MENDENHALL: And, therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that
33 the villages desire the subsistence rate to be the same at the
34 moment, for '98-99. Freddy, I'm trying to follow you here.

35
36 MS. CROSS: The recommendation from the village has
37 raised the quota from three percent to five percent and I was
38 just saying what he was saying would be good support for that
39 because the reason why we would like to see it raised is
40 because the village is saying the current rate does not meet
41 the subsistence needs of the communities.

42
43 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay, those are basically the four
44 sections.

45
46 MR. ADKISSON: Four elements, yeah.

47
48 MR. MENDENHALL: Four elements of the therefores. But
49 the WHEREAS can be based on whatever the villages say.

50

00128

1 MR. BOYD: Okay. I'm not sure that we caught all of
2 that, but I want to make sure, so.

3
4 MS. ARMSTRONG: Maybe during a break we can it all and
5 write it.

6
7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Can we go ahead and.....

8
9 MS. CROSS: So maybe somebody can start drafting it and
10 then we can look at it a little bit later and finish it over
11 and we can just continue on our meeting. Somebody will draft
12 something for us and then we can look at it after the break.

13
14 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay.

15
16 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Should we go ahead and pass a
17 motion and adopt it and.....

18
19 MS. CROSS: We already have.

20
21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK:then have it drafted?

22
23 MR. MENDENHALL: Oh, we need to be specific on the
24 motion for Deering, Buckland that I wanted to at the beginning.
25 I make a motion to protect the interest of Unit 23, Deering and
26 Buckland, to the have the 75 percent rate of Federal and 25
27 percent State musk-ox hunt at the rate of five percent --
28 somewhere and they'll work it out.

29
30 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: And that's your.....

31
32 MR. MENDENHALL: That's my motion.

33
34 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion been made by Perry, do I
35 hear a second?

36
37 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

38
39 MR. MENDENHALL: Call for question.

40
41 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question been called. All in favor
42 -- or discussion?

43
44 MR. ENINGOWUK: He called for question.

45
46 MR. MENDENHALL: I called for question.

47
48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. All in favor signify by
49 saying aye.

50

00129

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay, motion passed, no nays.

4

5 MR. MENDENHALL: Whose drafting it now?

6

7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: This would be -- do you have the
8 resolution number? We have -- this would be 98-031701.

9

10 MR. BOYD: I need to confer with my staff, Mr. Chair,
11 and we'll get somebody drafting this and hopefully you'll have
12 something to look at.

13

14 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you.

15

16 MS. CROSS: What time is it now?

17

18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: What time do we have?

19

20 MR. MENDENHALL: Now, do we need a motion for 22?

21

22 (No audible response)

23

24 MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion to accept the staff
25 recommendation of 22(E) and (D) for a five percent
26 State/Federal hunt for '98-99.

27

28 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Is there a second?

29

30 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

31

32 MS. CROSS: I'm confused now. I thought we were
33 talking about resolution -- making a resolution, why are we
34 supporting five percent?

35

36 MR. MENDENHALL: The reason why we're doing it is
37 because we separated one motion and making it two at this time
38 and it'll be very clear on the resolution when it comes out of
39 it.

40

41 MS. CROSS: Oh, okay.

42

43 MR. MENDENHALL: Shishmaref is requesting that this be
44 done. And I'm verbalizing what he wants.

45

46 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I have a question, Ken. Do we need
47 then for Unit 22, do we need another resolution?

48

49 MR. MENDENHALL: No.

50

00130

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Or just a motion?

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: No, we're just doing the motion here,
4 they'll do the resolution in one. Is that what you need?
5 Where the simple discussion is that subsistence needs of the
6 villages have not been met under the current percentage.

7

8 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Ken.

9

10 MR. ADKISSON: We can one resolution with all these
11 (indiscernible - interrupted).....

12

13 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, from these two motion, but we're
14 making two motions right now.

15

16 MR. ADKISSON: Right.

17

18 MR. MENDENHALL: Because it should -- that's what
19 we're.....

20

21 MR. ENINGOWUK: We just made a motion for 23, we should
22 also do one for 22.

23

24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Could you reread your motion,
25 Mr. Mendenhall?

26

27 MR. MENDENHALL: The motion for 22(D) and (E) villages,
28 Shishmaref, Deering, Brevig, Teller, to have a State
29 subsistence hunt of five percent, due to the reason the present
30 system is not meeting the subsistence needs of the villages.
31 Simple.

32

33 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Do we have a second?

34

35 MR. MENDENHALL: He second.

36

37 MR. KATCHATAG: Second.

38

39 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Second by Fred. All in favor -- or
40 call for question. All in favor signify by saying aye.

41

42 IN UNISON: Aye.

43

44 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Motion carried.

45

46 MR. MENDENHALL: That way the numbers come out. Then
47 within those WHEREASEs, WHEREAS a motion been made for 22 and
48 23 at that five percent that WHEREAS would be and THEREFORE it
49 be spelled out. It's clear as we can get it, huh?

50

00131

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Mr. Adkisson, do you have anything
2 else you want to add? The State Board is going to take action
3 so we just make the recommendation.

4
5 MR. ADKISSON: No. I'd like to see the draft when it's
6 done and work with the folks and go from there.

7
8 MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, if you want to take a break,
9 we can write it up during the break and then give it to you.

10
11 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Right. I'll call a break at this
12 time, five minutes.

13
14 (Off record)

15
16 (On record)

17
18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All the meeting back to order.
19 And, Helen, could you please read the resolution?

20
21 MS. ARMSTRONG: This is Helen Armstrong from
22 subsistence. The resolution as drafted reads:

23
24 WHEREAS, the present musk-ox subsistence hunt is not
25 meeting the subsistence needs of the Seward Peninsula Region;

26
27 WHEREAS, the Seward Peninsula musk-ox cooperators have
28 met extensively from October 1997 to March 1998 to seek a joint
29 Federal and State musk-ox harvest;

30
31 WHEREAS, the Federal subsistence rate of three percent
32 has not met the subsistence needs of the villages and the musk-
33 ox cooperators determine the joint rate of a five percent
34 harvest of the musk-ox population should be established;

35
36 WHEREAS, the Unit 23 villages, Deering and Buckland met
37 jointly in March 1998 and determined that they want a 75
38 percent Federal and 25 percent State musk-ox hunt;

39
40 WHEREAS, Unit 22(D) and (E) desire a 50 percent State
41 and 50 percent Federal musk-ox hunt;

42
43 WHEREAS, the Seward Peninsula Regional Council met
44 March 17th, 1998 in Anchorage to review all resolutions and
45 proposals to be submitted for recommendations to be made to the
46 State Board of Game;

47
48 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Seward
49 Peninsula Regional Advisory Council recommends to the State
50 Board of Game that Unit 23 have a harvest of 75 percent Federal

00132

1 and 25 percent State musk-ox harvest of the five percent of the
2 musk-ox population in that area -- I think we need to kind of
3 fix that sentence;

4
5 AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in Unit 22(D) and (E)
6 share a 50/50 percent State and Federal musk-ox harvest of five
7 percent of the musk-ox population in Unit 22(D) and (E);

8
9 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if the
10 1998-99 hunt is not satisfactory and does not add to the
11 subsistence opportunity for the six villages, the Seward
12 Peninsula Regional Advisory Council will request that the
13 Federal Subsistence Board to restore the Federal hunt to it's
14 preexisting level of three percent of the animals within the
15 subunit.

16
17 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Helen.

18
19 MS. ARMSTRONG: You're welcome.

20
21 MS. DEWHURST: Do you want me to explain ducks next?
22 It's short.

23
24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes, could you, Donna.

25
26 MS. DEWHURST: This is on the Migratory Bird Treaty
27 Act, it's an update. The migratory bird, most of you guys are
28 familiar, there's a Migratory Bird Treaty Act that's been under
29 negotiations now for a number of years to try to put in spring
30 waterfowl hunting. It was signed and ratified by the Senate in
31 October of 1997, so we've ratified the treaty, updating the
32 treaty with Canada and Mexico. There were three Native
33 Alaskans on the team, Myron Naneng, Charlie Brower and Jonathan
34 Solomon.

35
36 Now ratification of the treaty does not automatically
37 make spring subsistence harvest legal, yet. Right now it
38 sounds like it'll be about four years before we actually have
39 real regulations in print. So until then the closed season
40 policy is still in effect. What they planning on doing is
41 setting up management bodies, which will be similar to the
42 Regional Advisory Councils, but they will not be the same. But
43 these management bodies will include Native, Federal, State
44 representatives, all as equal players developing
45 recommendations for seasons and bag limits, law enforcement
46 policies, the whole nine yards. Village Councils will be
47 involved to the maximum percent possible.

48
49 Eligibility for this spring waterfowl hunt was decided
50 that it would mean any permanent resident of a village within a

00133

1 subsistence harvest area regardless of race. Because
2 originally it was requested for Natives only, but the U.S.
3 Senate changed that. The subsistence harvest areas will
4 include the Alaska Peninsula, Kodiak Archipelago, the Aleutian
5 Islands and areas north and west of the Alaska Range, which
6 would be Yukon Delta, Seward Pen, Northwest Arctic, basically
7 everything north and west of Cook Inlet area.

8
9 Areas that would not qualify under the State's
10 subsistence, the spring subsistence hunt would be residents of
11 Anchorage, Matanuska-Susitna Valley, Fairbanks North Star
12 Borough, the Kenai Peninsula road area, the Gulf of Alaska road
13 area and Southeast Alaska. So as of right now those areas will
14 not be included under these developed spring waterfowl harvest.

15
16 That's it in a nutshell, so I know it's probably a
17 little bit disappointing that it's going to be another four
18 years before there's actually laws in effect that will make it
19 legal to hunt spring ducks, but the process is moving along.
20 It's estimated it'll take two years to get these management
21 bodies or these Councils developed that actually write these
22 regulations and then it takes another year to two years to
23 actually put them into law, make them Federal law, so that's
24 why they're guessing three to four years for when they'll
25 actually be a nice book of spring harvest -- spring duck
26 harvest regulations.

27
28 And until then enforcement is going to be loose.
29 They're not going to be out there heavily checking everybody.
30 I think any violation would have to be pretty blatant, i.e.,
31 somebody has a boatload of ducks and they're going to try to
32 sell them or something, you know, it's not going to be -- if
33 you go out and shoot two pintails, I don't think there's going
34 to be an agent on your tail, you know, following, hiding in the
35 bushes, it's not going to be anything -- you know, there's not
36 going to be a big enforcement effort until this is in place.
37 So even though it's illegal, enforcement isn't going to be a
38 real strong effect.

39
40 The main things they are interested in enforcing is
41 protecting the species that are in trouble, things like
42 spectacled eiders, emperor geese, cackling geese, cackling
43 Canada geese, trying to think what -- brant, some of the
44 species that they're very concerned about. Really all the
45 eiders, not so much king and common but spectacled and stellers
46 eiders they are very concerned about, so those species they'll
47 be watching. But if you go out and shoot a mallard in the
48 spring, I don't think there's going to be a big concern about
49 it.

50

00134

1 So that's kind of the message to put out, so that
2 people don't worry -- to let folks know don't worry about it
3 and that we're trying to develop the regulations, but it's a
4 major step to get the treaty ratified and approved by Congress.
5 This is a step in the right direction, they've been working on
6 it for a lot of years and it's really great that that has gone
7 through. And now the next step is to actually write the laws
8 that'll make spring harvest legal and make everybody in line.
9 Stuff that everybody has been doing for a lot of years, but
10 make it legal.

11
12 MR. KATCHATAG: You know, you cannot -- you're not
13 going to get any ducks anyways unless you're a good caller.
14 And the ducks that come up here does not go to the commercial
15 type caller, they won't go to them. I don't know why. And in
16 falltime they fly so high that nobody is going to get any ducks
17 anyhow unless those ducks -- if they lay in Russia they might
18 get them there at their home base, you know, where they spend
19 all summer there. But when they come home from wherever they
20 come from, Barrow or wherever, Greenland, there's so high that
21 all you do is -- you just barely hear them sometimes. You
22 don't get very much. And that's why the species and line of
23 ducks are growing. You can see cranes going home for days.
24 And them other kind, geese, they come home at nighttime, so you
25 can hear them call, but you can't hardly see them nighttime,
26 that's in October and September. They're well protected. God
27 knows what he's doing.

28
29 MS. DEWHURST: This will apply to, to egging, as far as
30 trying to develop regulations, it's not just hunting, it will
31 include spring egging, which has been a common practice for a
32 long time.

33
34 Now one think that I have heard that there's talk that
35 there will be some enforcement on this coming year is the steel
36 shot, lead shot/steel shot.

37
38 MR. BUCK: May I interrupt?

39
40 MS. DEWHURST: Sure.

41
42 MR. BUCK: This is Peter Buck.

43
44 MS. DEWHURST: Um-hum.

45
46 MR. BUCK: Jeff King just going into Nome now, right
47 now he's (phone fade).....

48
49 MS. DEWHURST: All right. That's for the update.

50

00135

1 MR. BUCK: Okay.

2

3 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Donna, this is just for
4 information?

5

6 MS. DEWHURST: Um-hum. Yeah, you guys don't have to
7 make any action on it. And the other thing that we heard at
8 other Council meetings was concern that if there was
9 enforcement what would it be? You know, if somebody was out
10 there and caught you spring duck hunting or using lead shot or
11 whatever. Most of the -- it's not going to mean you're going
12 to get arrested or anybody is going to get arrested, it might
13 mean a ticket and the violation notice or a ticket usually the
14 range would be \$100-250 would be a worse case scenario.

15

16 But there has been concern because I think it as the
17 North Slope Council meeting somebody was worried that they
18 would be arrested if they were caught. And it's like, no,
19 we're not arresting people for spring duck hunting, it's not
20 anything along that line, but, you know -- and I don't think
21 there's going to be a strong enforcement effort no matter what,
22 so it's -- they're not interested in creating a lot
23 confrontational situations. We're trying to work together to
24 get this all worked out and get everybody in line and get
25 everything legal, what's been going on for hundreds of years,
26 make it legal for once.

27

28 Any other questions? You'll probably be hearing more
29 on this later.

30

31 MS. CROSS: You said entire Southeast Alaska, right?

32

33 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, that's what it says in here, yeah,
34 they're considering Southeast Alaska out. Now it does say that
35 that can be petitioned, so there might be specific villages or
36 groups, areas in Southeast Alaska that may petition to be
37 included.

38

39 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I'm sorry, Council members, I know
40 we're jumping around and one thing I want to get
41 understandings, who are we going to send to the meeting up in
42 Fairbanks? Any recommendation from the Council who should go
43 up to submit this supporting resolution? We would like if
44 Perry could go up to Fairbanks to present Board of Game.

45

46 MR. MENDENHALL: If you pay my way.

47

48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Tom mentioned that he would take
49 care of that.

50

00136

1 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah.

2
3 MR. BOYD: I took care of your other problem.

4
5 MR. MENDENHALL: Subsistence (indiscernible).....

6
7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So we have -- we're going along.

8
9 MR. MENDENHALL: Where are we?

10
11 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We were down to Bering Land Bridge.

12
13 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair, I need to go, but I just wanted
14 to say, I appreciated being with you today and hope you get
15 home safely.

16
17 MR. KATCHATAG: Me too.

18
19 MR. MENDENHALL: Thank you, Tom

20
21 MR. BOYD: And Cliff will work with Perry on the travel
22 arrangements. Have a good trip home, thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Mr. Boyd. Are we down
25 to Bering Land Bridge or we're done with that?

26
27 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair, there were a couple of other
28 things I had but I think they'll keep to the next meeting and
29 we've taken care of this agenda item, so I'll just close and
30 you can go on to the next one.

31
32 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Ken.

33
34 MR. MENDENHALL: Still frozen.

35
36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Cliff, you're next.

37
38 MR. EDENSHAW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What I have is
39 just a short presentation. At the last meeting in Unalakleet,
40 Jeff Denton was in Unalakleet and we just weren't able to have
41 a quorum, so in our conversations at the airport and briefly in
42 Unalakleet, he submitted a two page letter and I just wanted to
43 touch upon some of the high points in his letter that he wrote
44 and concerns that he conveyed to me at the airport on our way
45 back to Anchorage. And I passed that out to the Council
46 members here this morning when I came in.

47
48 The first item is the BLM continues to receive reports
49 of local residents of Game Management Unit 22(A) regarding
50 chronic wanton waste of caribou, brown bear, waterfowl and

00137

1 occasionally moose. And this has been brought to the attention
2 of the Council in the past and action in the form of letters to
3 the Yukon Delta Regional Advisory Council have resulted.
4 Caribou and brown bear reports have been received in 1994 in
5 the Unalakleet area. Caribou and brown bear in 1995 in the
6 Unalakleet and Glosovia/South River area, caribou and brown
7 bear in the Unalakleet, Glosovia/South River area in 1996.
8 Caribou and brown bear in the Glosovia/South River area and
9 brown bear on the Unalakleet and North Rivers in 1997. And
10 caribou in the Glosovia/South River area in 1998. Since the
11 Western Arctic Herd has extended its use area into the south
12 portion of 22(A) lower Yukon Village hunters have come into
13 22(A) to hunt. Local hunters have found and reported kills
14 left in the field and indicated lower Yukon hunters as
15 responsible as several occasions. The concern of St. Michael
16 hunters is that this wanton waste will be blamed on them
17 instead of their newcomer lower Yukon hunters.

18
19 And that was one, and the other one I wanted to touch
20 upon was the c&t determination that you addressed this morning
21 for a c&t determination that was granted by the Board for
22 caribou in Unit 22(A), regarding the three villages, Hooper
23 Bay, Scammon Bay and Chevak. Jeff said that there was
24 significant dissatisfaction with the c&t determination for the
25 lower Yukon villages to hunt caribou in 22(A), including
26 Proposal and RFR 97-12, to reconsider c&t for caribou in Unit
27 22(A) by subsistence users from Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay and
28 Chevak. And he goes on to say there's no consensus or
29 validation from elders in the southern 22(A) villages where the
30 extension of caribou c&t to these lower Yukon villages.

31
32 I won't belabor that anymore because the Regional
33 Council rejected the RFR.

34
35 And the other four items are pretty much self-
36 explanatory, but the one point that he did convey to me was the
37 wanton waste, and I wanted to mention that. And the Council
38 members have in front of them the letter that he submitted.
39 That was to be his extent of his report for BLM for the Seward
40 Peninsula Region.

41
42 And also if you look under Tab S, he also submitted in
43 your booklets, he submitted the Unalakleet Village Subsistence
44 Reporting System Annual Report for the region up there, and
45 that was like a 13 page report that he -- that was inside the
46 booklets.

47
48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: What tab?

49
50 MR. MENDENHALL: R.

00138

1 (Pause)

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: Do we need any action on this?

4

5 MR. EDENSHAW: No, Perry, that's for information.

6

7 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Peter, for your information, we're
8 just going through the Unalakleet Subsistence Reporting System
9 Annual Report, it's for July 1, 1996 through June 30, 1997. It
10 was compiled by Jeff Denton, Anchorage District BLM.

11

12 So there's no action need at this time for this item.

13 Anything else Mr. Edenshaw?

14

15 MR. MENDENHALL: Maybe we could tell -- since he's from
16 Unalakleet we can him about they're on notice for spotlighting.

17

18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes.

19

20 MR. MENDENHALL: Maybe he could tell his people.

21

22 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yeah.

23

24 MR. KATCHATAG: It's been -- that action took down
25 Glosovia, killing all that caribou was somebody from down lower
26 Yukon that came over there with snowmachine and kill all those.
27 Unalakleet people don't hunt caribou in Glosovia, that's too
28 far to go. There's -- we go a little ways and then I never see
29 people unless sometime we hear that it's the high school
30 students that do that. And I think -- I don't know if I should
31 say this or not. It's those halfbreeds that grew up with their
32 mother, without dad, that seems to be in the highlight, that's
33 doing this killing for bear and seven -- as for caribou, I've
34 been out probably in month of December and January, I've never
35 seen anybody doing that. Hoping that I would catch someone,
36 but I don't.

37

38 It's -- to my knowledge our future leaders don't look
39 very -- they don't look very good from my estimation. Even in
40 the schools you start hearing these things. Sometimes I feel
41 like going to speak to the kids in the school, but I don't get
42 no invitation and I can't go there and volunteer for these
43 things. You see the -- I told my people when I can to start
44 reading their Bible. I'm not here to preach but something like
45 this, when you read something like this you can't help but --
46 your memory will go to your Bible and all the prophecies in the
47 Bible are fulfilling now. And there are a lot of people in the
48 villages that don't know this because they're not reading their
49 Bible.

50

00139

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Mr. Katchatag, could we go on,
2 since we're sort of.....

3
4 MR. KATCHATAG: Yeah, we can go -- you can go ahead.

5
6 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Go on to another item.

7
8 MR. KATCHATAG: Yeah. You see, something like this is
9 something that.....

10
11 MR. MENDENHALL: I think we could table until our next
12 meeting and go through.....

13
14 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I'm not really familiar with -- I
15 guess we're not all familiar with that.

16
17 MR. KATCHATAG: Okay, we can go on.

18
19 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So on the things that I read, like
20 reindeer getting -- people harvesting caribou or reindeer as
21 caribou, why those caribous are -- they thing that caribous
22 originated from that area and we have some history that goes
23 back to when they were driving reindeer from (indiscernible) or
24 St. Mary's they lost a lot of reindeer back in the early '50s
25 and -- or late '50s, early and late '50s, so there should be
26 some more data. I know there are more data on the history of
27 the reindeer and caribou, so I'd like to recommend that we go
28 ahead bring it up on the next meeting after we -- it's a lot of
29 reading. I haven't read it, to be honest, what this report
30 consists of.

31
32 We'll go on to our next item and that's Regional
33 Council charter.

34
35 MR. EDENSHAW: Yeah, Mr. Chair and Council members,
36 under Tab T we have renewal of the Regional Council charters.
37 And just on the top you can look along with me. The charters
38 are under FACA, the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The
39 charters provide the guidelines for our Regional Council
40 structure and procedures. And the Seward Pen charter, as is
41 the other nine, expire on December 2nd, and that's in even
42 number years, this is 1998, so the Secretary of Interior with
43 the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture must renew the
44 charters by December 2nd and so with that the -- during the
45 winter of 1998 meetings the Regional Councils are asked to
46 provide recommendations on their charters and these
47 recommendations are forwarded to the Federal Subsistence Board
48 which will meet in June 1998 to provide advice to the
49 Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture.

50

00140

1 And if you look on the following page on -- that would
2 be two, three and four, on the following page it has the
3 charter of the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council, and
4 if you go over to number 9, those are the changes that the
5 Regional Council, and we had addressed alternates previously,
6 probably about a year ago, and what the Council had recommended
7 was nine members and two alternates. As you can see the
8 recommended changes that the Council are putting forth are two
9 alternates who shall be knowledgeable and experienced in
10 matters relating to subsistence uses of fish and wildlife and
11 are residents of the region represented by the Council. One
12 alternate shall be an resident within the subregion of Unit
13 22(A) or (B) and one alternate shall be a resident within the
14 Subunit of 22(D) or (E). And then the last one is the
15 alternate shall attend Council meetings only in the event that
16 a regularly appointed member is unable to attend.

17
18 So those are the changes in your charter that was
19 brought out at the Regional Council meeting about a year ago, I
20 believe.

21
22 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Do we need any action on this
23 charter?

24
25 MR. EDENSHAW: I recall at the last meeting that there
26 was action taken on that, a motion was made and when the Board
27 meets in June, along with this charter and the others, those
28 recommendations will be put forth to the Federal Subsistence
29 Board.

30
31 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Next item 11 -- I think this is
32 item 10 actually or nine, Federal Subsistence Program update.
33 We just went through it.

34
35 MR. EDENSHAW: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

36
37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes.

38
39 MR. EDENSHAW: Sue Detwiler from the office was going
40 to give a presentation on ADF&G, on coordination.

41
42 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. Yeah, Sue.

43
44 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Under item 11, most of the
45 sub-items there are just informational and I won't go over
46 those, unless you want me to, but there is one item at the top
47 which the Board is asking for your comments on, if you want.
48 And that is coordination with the Department of Fish and Game.
49 And.....

50

00141

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Where is this under?

2

3 MS. DETWILER: It's under Item 11, Tab T.

4

5 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Tab T.

6

7 MS. DETWILER: And there should be a paper in there,
8 several pages long.

9

10 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes.

11

12 MS. DETWILER: The issue there is that since last year
13 there has been a Federal/State working group that's been trying
14 to look at different ways to improve the coordination between
15 the State and the Federal Subsistence Program. And since your
16 last meeting they've come up with three suggestions for
17 improving that coordination, and two of them are pretty
18 innocuous, straightforward, we've already implemented those.

19 But one is -- one that the Board wants your comments on
20 before it's actually implemented and that is whether or not to
21 issue the Department of Fish and Game a standing invitation to
22 sit in on the -- or to participate in the Staff Committee
23 meetings to provide technical assistance.

24

25 And just in case anybody is not aware, the Staff
26 Committee is the interagency groups that meets periodically to
27 advise -- to develop recommendations to the Board on
28 subsistence issues. And up until this point they've been
29 pretty closed meetings, just among the Federal agencies, but
30 when the Federal/State working group has met, they came up with
31 a recommendation to include the Department of Fish and Game in
32 those Staff Committee meetings because the Federal program
33 depends so heavily on the State's database.

34

35 And the purpose of offering that standing invitation to
36 ADF&G to sit in those Staff Committee meetings would be to make
37 sure -- to allow the Department of Fish and -- to have Fish and
38 Game there to answer questions about the technical information
39 to make sure that the data that we rely on that is produced by
40 the State is accurate and up to date. And that the Staff
41 Committee knows the limitations in using the data.

42

43 So the State would not be sitting in on the Staff
44 Committee meetings to engage in the actual decision-making or
45 the deliberations, they would just be there to provide the
46 technical advice. And by the same token, the recommendation
47 also includes inviting the Regional Councils to provide
48 elaboration of Regional Council recommendations or information
49 on an as needed basis as well, although it's pretty likely that
50 the Councils wouldn't be called upon as frequently as the -- or

00142

1 not the Councils, but the Council Chairs to be invited to the
2 Staff Committee meetings, but it's likely that Fish and Game
3 would participate more than Council Chairs.

4
5 So the gist of this agenda item is to just raise that
6 as an issue to you see if -- see what your comments are on
7 expanding participation in the Staff Committee meetings, to
8 Fish and Game primarily, but also to a lesser extent Council
9 Chairs as needed.

10
11 MR. KATCHATAG: How often do you have Staff meetings?

12
13 MS. DETWILER: Staff Committee meets usually once a
14 month just as issues arise, they don't have set dates, but just
15 when issues come up they meet.

16
17 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: What's the wish of the Council? I
18 don't have any problem with it, I think it's.....

19
20 MR. MENDENHALL: They need it.

21
22 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK:good for public relations.

23
24 MR. MENDENHALL: They need each other.

25
26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yeah.

27
28 MS. CROSS: I have a question then. On the -- is it a
29 lesser degree, the Chairs -- would that be when -- you're not
30 talking about the entire Chairs of the RAC, you're talking
31 about maybe the Chair of the particular region that's being
32 affected by a certain ruling or.....

33
34 MS. DETWILER: Um-hum. Just if there's a need for
35 clarification of the Council position or, you know, some
36 information that the Council Chair might have, that would be
37 when the Staff Committee would call them up and ask for their
38 participation.

39
40 MS. CROSS: I think it's something that we needed for a
41 long time.

42
43 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: This letter we got from Jeff Denton
44 was pretty surprising to me how much we know and how much we
45 don't know. How the caribou originated and if there was
46 caribou originating from that area, I'm pretty sure that that's
47 possible because we've had reindeers in the past, even today,
48 so I think it would be good to have a staff member present to
49 provide technical service -- technical information.

50

00143

1 And one thing I'd like to see, probably next meeting,
2 if we could dig up all these facts about the caribou and
3 reindeer and the bear. Bears being relocated from Kodiak to
4 Anvik area.

5
6 Just for the Council's information, in the past when
7 St. Mary's Mission was still open, there was one of the herders
8 brought 2,500 heads of reindeer down to St. Mary's Catholic
9 Church and the reindeer herder took it upon themself [sic] to
10 butcher and kept the money after they sell the meat. And I
11 guess that's how the St. Mary's Mission was kept open. And
12 during that time those reindeers would be in the storm, they
13 would run away and I don't know what percent of that 2,500 got
14 lost and we never saw it again. And second time that happened
15 there was another drive from Stebbins area to St. Mary's again
16 and this time it was about 1,500 heads. And they did the same,
17 butcher it and then the rest of them disappeared into the
18 hills.

19
20 So I'm thinking that that was the reason why that
21 caribou population went up, some of the reasons. So if you can
22 research and find this information, I'm sure that it will be
23 helpful to the Council and bring it up in our next meeting. If
24 you could find information both on bear and caribou and
25 reindeer.

26
27 MR. MENDENHALL: So where are we now?

28
29 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: We were on Sue.

30
31 MR. MENDENHALL: We've already done S.

32
33 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: And Helen Armstrong, family. Thank
34 you, Sue.

35
36 MS. DEWHURST: She just stepped out, she should be back
37 in a few minutes.

38
39 MR. MENDENHALL: Is there any more?

40
41 MS. CROSS: I was going to make a comment about -- you
42 know, with the Department Fish and Game providing technical
43 assistance. Perry, I think that would be very good because of
44 our region, it's going on to fisheries, too.

45
46 MR. MENDENHALL: Pardon?

47
48 MS. CROSS: I said for our region, what's going on with
49 our fisheries, I think that it's very good that they'll be
50 working together and I really thoroughly support that.

00144

1 MR. MENDENHALL: Um-hum.

2

3 MS. CROSS: Because they really do need to work
4 together in order to decide what they're going to do, because
5 other parts of the State are affecting our fisheries, so I
6 really like the idea.

7

8 MS. DETWILER: Thank you. Excuse me, Mr. Chair, while
9 Helen is out of the room, there was one other item that I can
10 just -- it's informational but it was kind of a big topic last
11 year and I can just tell you. On Federal Subsistence Board
12 restructuring, the taskforce that met that was composed of
13 Mitch Demientieff and Bill Thomas and Jim Caplan from the
14 Forest Service and Dave Allen from Fish and Wildlife Service,
15 they reviewed the Regional Council comments on Board
16 restructuring, after all of your meetings last fall.

17

18 And what they recommended to the Board for
19 restructuring was not to restructure but instead to change the
20 process to allow more opportunity for the Regional Councils to
21 participate in the discussions with the Board. So that --
22 assuming that all of the remaining three Board members vote in
23 favor of that recommendation the Board would not pursue
24 restructuring itself to include Regional Council Chairs or any
25 other members, they would simply just change the process to
26 allow more participation by the Council Chairs.

27

28 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: How would we get more involved?
29 Would it be through teleconference or what ways do we -- can we
30 get -- be involved in?

31

32 MS. DETWILER: What the taskforce discussed was at that
33 Board meetings when the Board is talking about proposals or any
34 other issues, rather than cutting off the Regional Council
35 comments when the Board starts its deliberation, what they
36 would do is be have the same step for Regional Council comments
37 on proposals and then cut it off temporarily while the Board
38 deliberates just among itself and then after the Board
39 deliberates, but before they take a final vote, then the
40 Council Chairs would have an opportunity to comment on any
41 issues that came up during the Board deliberations. So the
42 Council Chairs, essentially, would have an opportunity right up
43 to the very end to have their say.

44

45 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I got a question. Does the
46 coordinators go attend the Board meetings also? Are they
47 involved in the process? I guess this question for Cliff. Do
48 you -- are you included in their deliberations?

49

50 MR. EDENSHAW: I attend the Board meetings, but I'm not

00145

1 involved in the deliberations.

2
3 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Oh, okay.

4
5 MR. EDENSHAW: The Regional Council Chair will
6 represent the Council at the meeting. For instance, in May
7 when we meet to address proposals you, yourself, will attend
8 the meeting in Anchorage here with the Federal Subsistence
9 Board and I'll be there for any information you need to
10 provide.

11
12 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Do you want to ask a question?
13 Perry.

14
15 MR. MENDENHALL: It seems like it's kind of patterned
16 after the State Fish Board and the State Board of Game because
17 they have a process where they public input testimony based on
18 each issue and then after that the cut off that input, then
19 deliberate. It tends to be working a lot more -- it's more of
20 a liberal, democratic process than it has been in the past.
21 And I'm sort of happy that the State is finally instigating
22 that. I think this is what we need to look at, how they put in
23 public input to this process and -- but again, we're just
24 Advisory Council as well.

25
26 MS. CROSS: There was much unhappiness about this, it's
27 been going on for about a couple of years now. There's much
28 unhappiness which is resulting in them getting a little more
29 input. Giving opportunity for more input.

30
31 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Anything else, Sue?

32
33 MS. DETWILER: No, thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you. Helen Armstrong.

36
37 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If you'll turn
38 to Tab T like in Ted. And if you go to the very back of Tab T
39 and then flip forward, it's the last three pages under Tab T.
40 It says, Issue Paper, Application of Family and Federal
41 Subsistence Management Regulations.

42
43 Did everybody find it?

44
45 MR. MENDENHALL: Yes.

46
47 MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. I'll give a little overview of
48 how we got to this place. You may remember last year when we
49 talked about there was a proposal from this Council for Unit
50 22(A) moose and there was some discussion about limiting the

00146

1 moose harvest to only 22(A) residents. And then when it became
2 clear to this Council that if they did that they'd be cutting
3 out some people like -- I think the example was given of
4 Grace's brother, maybe, who hunts in 22(A), but comes from St.
5 Lawrence Island. And so then the Council decided, after a lot
6 of deliberation to come up with a regulation that said 22(A)
7 residents and their family. Well the Federal Subsistence Board
8 rejected the family portion of that proposal and said they
9 couldn't do it in their regulations as they regulations existed
10 right now, but that they would look into it. They made a
11 promise to go back and look at the issues and see if they could
12 do something differently.

13
14 The Solicitor to the Federal Subsistence Board also
15 talked at length about it at the Board meeting last year.
16 Between the Board meeting and the fall meeting we did a lot of
17 talking about what to do, and you may recall last fall that
18 this Council decided not to come forward with a proposal to
19 change the regulation and to see what happened when we had an
20 issue paper created.

21
22 So between the last Council meeting and this Council
23 meeting we did go and write this issue paper, which I'll go
24 over in a minute. Where we are with this is at the main
25 meeting the Board will be briefed on what we found and then
26 it'll be up to the Board to decide what to do at that point.
27 They could decide that they need to get an official opinion
28 from the Solicitor to get a legal opinion. You know, who knows
29 what they may decide to do, they may decide that they don't
30 want to go any further with it, so it's a little bit in limbo
31 right now as to where it's going. We really don't know what
32 the outcome will be when it goes to the Board.

33
34 And what we found in the issue paper was that things
35 are a little bit unclear as to how family -- not even a little,
36 it's very unclear as to how family gets applied in ANILCA. The
37 definition that the Council used last year to approach the
38 family issue was using the definition in Section 803 of ANILCA
39 that applies to the taking of subsistence resources and that
40 definition -- it's specifically defined in Section 803, this is
41 on the next page, on the top.

42
43 It defines subsistence uses as the customary and
44 traditional uses by rural Alaska residents of wild renewable
45 resources for direct personal or family consumption as food,
46 shelter, fuel, clothing, tool or transportation. And goes on
47 to talk about it being taken for personal family consumption
48 for barter or sharing or for personal and family consumption
49 and for customary trade. For the purposes of this section the
50 term family means all persons related by blood, marriage or

00147

1 adoption or any person living within the household on a
2 permanent basis.

3
4 Now what we found was this really talks -- they do
5 define family in here, but it really only talks about the using
6 of the resources and not actually the taking, so how it's
7 getting used, but not who actually is doing the hunting. And
8 so then since it wasn't in Section 803 we looked at some of the
9 legislative history, and I was on this committee, I actually
10 found it quite interesting because I'd never done this reading
11 before and, you know, there's some argument that what's in the
12 legislative history isn't what was in ANILCA and so you can't
13 take it as being, you know, totally what -- just because it
14 might have been the intent, if it didn't appear in ANILCA then
15 perhaps you can't take that seriously. But, in any case, in
16 the Senate report of the Committee on Energy and Natural
17 Resources they did reiterate the definition of subsistence uses
18 and reported -- the report also defined family in a similar as
19 what appears in ANILCA.

20
21 What came out from looking at the Senate report was
22 that they specifically did not want to define who could take
23 the subsistence resources, that that was something that had to
24 be determined by the rulemaking authority along with the advice
25 of the Regional Councils. And I think they clearly were
26 avoiding the who question, of who gets to do the hunting.

27
28 But then when you read further in ANILCA you get to
29 Section 804 which defines what happens when there aren't enough
30 of a resource and ANILCA really doesn't define the who question
31 until you get to the question of there aren't enough and so
32 then they start distinguishing between who can hunt it. And in
33 Section 804 it becomes, and this is at the bottom of the -- the
34 page numbers aren't in her, but it would be the bottom of the
35 third page. Section 804, the taking on public land of fish and
36 wildlife is, according to the following criteria, I'm sort of
37 summarizing there, customary and direct dependence upon the
38 populations as the main stay of livelihood and local residency.
39 And then that's when you get the question of who can take it,
40 so it becomes restricted.

41
42 On the next page the we talk a little bit about the
43 intent and what I found interesting was that there was -- the
44 intent of Congress and Morris Udall talked about this in 1980,
45 was that ANILCA should be designed in such a way that Alaska
46 Natives would be able to determine for themselves their own
47 cultural orientation and the rate and degree of evolution, if
48 any, of their Alaska Native culture. And I think in there, and
49 this is where I think a lot of people have some issue over
50 this, is because they see ANILCA being something that's not

00148

1 only for Alaska Natives but for all Native and non-Native rural
2 residents. But there was certainly an intent by Congress that
3 any ambiguities in the Title and other provisions must be
4 resolved in favor of the Alaska Native people.

5
6 I think there were a few points that Congressman Udall
7 made that you could interpret this to mean that any ambiguities
8 in the legislation, so if there were things that weren't clear,
9 then it has to be resolved in favor of Alaska Native people.
10 Another point was that the management of public lands should
11 cause the least adverse impact possible on rural residents who
12 depend upon the subsistence uses. And the third was that the
13 intent of the bill was to protect community cohesion. And if
14 you look at a family provision being something that would
15 promote cohesion in the community, cohesion between families,
16 because you could then take -- you know, a brother who comes
17 back to visit you, you could take them hunting and they could
18 actually hunt, not just go along for the hunt to promote
19 cohesion in the family, if you look at it from that
20 perspective.

21
22 But it is ambiguous, we don't really know what the
23 intent of the legislation was. Go ahead.

24
25 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, at the AFN level for rural
26 Alaska, we don't want ANILCA to be touched at all or changed
27 because we don't want no other agendas added to any -- when
28 it's opened.

29
30 MS. ARMSTRONG: Right.

31
32 MR. MENDENHALL: And also at the Fish Board meeting we
33 had in Nome, that issue of family came up and it's been
34 somewhat accepted to the point where even on Native corporation
35 lands we have camp permits already given out, like, 250 camp
36 permits. Not all of them are Native, some of them are non-
37 Native. Which Joe Garnie doesn't like, really, but he's also a
38 member of my corporation. And you've always was content on
39 that, but even at this point we have shareholders from
40 Anchorage and other parts of Alaska living that come back every
41 summer to their fish camp to fish and hunt on the land claims
42 as shareholders. And I don't see how you can force the
43 corporation, say, well, you can't fish or hunt off your camp
44 site now, even though they live outside the region. That's an
45 issue and I think if you go to other village corporations they
46 have that same power, they have camp sites that are inherited
47 by shareholders of land claims.

48
49 MR. KATCHATAG: Maybe they have permitted that without
50 the knowledge of the Native people.

00149

1 MR. MENDENHALL: Pardon?

2
3 MR. KATCHATAG: They might have implemented that with
4 the knowledge of the Native people.

5
6 MR. MENDENHALL: They're just not -- all across the
7 State on all Native corporation land, even Shishmaref have camp
8 sites where they -- on all these Native allotments.

9
10 MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

11
12 MR. MENDENHALL: That's a legal can of worms right now,
13 even the State doesn't know how to go about -- the way that
14 Fish Board did to Nome on this subsistence, say you guys in
15 Nome area handle it. They have non-Natives and every group in
16 town on that decision-making process right now, on the State
17 level so they won't have -- so it'll fit the constitutionality.
18 And a constitution amendment is what we want to force the
19 situation.....

20
21 MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

22
23 MR. MENDENHALL:to acknowledge our rural
24 subsistence hunting.

25
26 MR. KATCHATAG: Don't you know that the State owns the
27 two feet of both sides of the river? All along, whether it be
28 allotment or not. The State owns two feet of that bank. State
29 of Alaska, even if it's an allotment.

30
31 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, it doesn't matter, the people
32 are camping there that are.....

33
34 MR. KATCHATAG: It don't matter, it don't matter, the
35 State is still the government for Alaska, they own two feet of
36 that bank, both sides of the river.

37
38 MR. MENDENHALL: I'm not arguing that point. I'm not
39 arguing that point. The point I.....

40
41 MR. KATCHATAG: It seems like they own that, even if
42 it's our camp site they still own that two feet of.....

43
44 MR. MENDENHALL: I know that the fact is that they have
45 management over that, we acknowledged that already.

46
47 MR. KATCHATAG: Okay.

48
49 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay. I wasn't making an issue of
50 that.

00150

1 MR. KATCHATAG: Okay.

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: I'm making an issue that non-residents
4 that are no longer living on them, but they have camp sites
5 that they go back and fish. This is what would determine the
6 family, they're having to deal with that family issue, an
7 extended family. And Nome has also asked for fishing for
8 elders, a proxy, because elders can't fish so, but they could
9 allow people of nome to fish and then bring the fish to the
10 elders. So I mean, they're trying to deal with it on that
11 level.

12

13 I'm just sort of -- so the State right now is burden
14 with that and they're going to have to deal with it on a
15 constitutional amendment. That's where the Natives want them
16 to deal with -- the State to deal with subsistence.

17

18 MS. ARMSTRONG: This wouldn't make any changes to
19 ANILCA. What we're looking at potentially changing is the
20 regulations that we implement, but it wouldn't change ANILCA,
21 there would be nothing there.

22

23 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah.

24

25 MS. ARMSTRONG: But it would be one of the provisions
26 in perhaps Subpart A, perhaps Subpart B of our Federal
27 Subsistence regulations that would have potentially some kind
28 of provision that says when a family member is visiting another
29 family member outside of their region that they could go
30 hunting with them. And, you know, something -- I don't really
31 know exactly how it would look, but something along that line.

32

33

34 But to just wrap up the issue paper, one thing that is
35 really clear in ANILCA is that it would only be applied to
36 rural residents and that comes through a number of places when
37 you're reading in the definitions. In Section 803 they clearly
38 say that it's the customary and traditional uses by rural
39 Alaska residents. Under findings in Section 801(4) rural is
40 again used to protect and provide the opportunity for continued
41 subsistence uses on the public lands by Native and non-Native
42 rural residents. And then again in Section 801 rural is used
43 to cause the least adverse impact possible on rural residents.
44 So I think it's very clear that this provision would only apply
45 to rural Alaskan residents visiting other rural Alaskan
46 residents.

47

48 So that is just a brief summary of what's in the issue
49 paper. There's not really any action the Council needs to take.
50 They can do what they choose to do, you don't have to, we're

00151

1 not taking this to the other Councils at this point, only to
2 this Council because you're the ones who had requested that
3 there be some kind of look on the Board's part at this issue.
4

5 MR. KATCHATAG: See we can overlook lot of these things
6 and still get along. It's not hard overlook something like
7 this.
8

9 MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.
10

11 MR. KATCHATAG: And what we need to do is understand
12 each other and get along. We need to help each other. I need
13 help, I know you need help.
14

15 MS. CROSS: I think complication became when rural
16 began, the word rural
17

18 MR. MENDENHALL: Um-hum, it still is.
19

20 MS. CROSS: Yeah, I mean that's where it gets.....
21

22 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, in urban Anchorage and Fairbanks
23 they will.....
24

25 MR. KATCHATAG: The less we talk about the rurals and
26 the urban the better off we're going to be. We're not here for
27 a lifetime anyway.
28

29 MS. CROSS: So at this point, the Board is
30 (indiscernible - interrupted).....
31

32 MR. MENDENHALL: Because it's already on the burners.
33

34 MS. CROSS:analysis of regulatory options will be
35 prepared for the Board's consideration. The Board's going to
36 be looking at this in May.
37

38 MS. ARMSTRONG: The Board may choose to do nothing.
39 They may say, thank you very much, and do nothing. They may
40 choose to go and ask for a legal opinion on it.....
41

42 MR. KATCHATAG: It's best to do nothing on it.
43

44 MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.
45

46 MR. MENDENHALL: I think it's on the burners of both
47 State and Federal right now, looking at each other on the
48 subsistence issue. I think the attorneys are already looking
49 at it, as well as AFN and their group, RuralCap, they're all
50 actively pursuing it.

00152

1 MS. CROSS: What I was saying the last time, it is
2 customary and traditional for somebody from different region
3 who's married into another region to go and hunt for the
4 families to begin with. When they brought that out about
5 restricting Unalakleet area for just residents there -- my
6 brother, Tom, goes there whenever -- like to help our sister-
7 in-law who is -- when a family member is not available is to
8 hunt, but he goes there and hunt for her.

9
10 MR. KATCHATAG: I'm from Unalakleet but I didn't know
11 anything about this. We never restricted nobody from our
12 hometown.

13
14 MS. CROSS: But anyway we've covered it enough.

15
16 MR. MENDENHALL: Information, just informational.

17
18 MS. CROSS: Cover it enough right now, yeah. The Board
19 may choose to do anything, they may not and we'll be back
20 discussing it if they decide to do something, we'll be
21 discussing regulatory options.

22
23 MR. MENDENHALL: The other thing to note is that other
24 agencies are -- and State and Federal are looking at it,
25 so.....

26
27 MS. CROSS: Um-hum. So it's something that been.....

28
29 MR. MENDENHALL: It's already there.

30
31 MS. ARMSTRONG: I don't think -- I have to disagree.
32 The Federal government is not looking at this issue.

33
34 MR. MENDENHALL: I know that, but the State is and AFN
35 and RuralCap, those people are having to.

36
37 MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, because I think -- yeah, that's
38 how it really.....

39
40 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay?

41
42 MS. ARMSTRONG: It's kind of new ground to be allowing
43 one person from one area to hunt in another area.

44
45 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, there's a State lawsuit on this
46 right now.

47
48 MS. CROSS: When there were no borders, we did that all
49 the time.

50

00153

1 MS. ARMSTRONG: Right, and it's a customary and
2 traditional practice and I think it's worth looking at if you'd
3 like that to continue to be able to do it legally. People do
4 it all the time now illegally.

5
6 MS. CROSS: When there was no such thing as 22(D) and
7 22(E) we did it all the time.

8
9 MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

10
11 MR. MENDENHALL: The State spent \$1,000,000 just to
12 fight this, they're already spending the money.

13
14 MS. ARMSTRONG: I know.

15
16 MS. CROSS: Okay, let's go on.

17
18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes. Thank you, Helen.

19
20 MS. CROSS: Thank you, it was very informative.

21
22 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I'm sure this will come up again
23 and we'll probably deal with it very soon.

24
25 MR. KATCHATAG: Where are we now?

26
27 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Time permitting any
28 recommendations.....

29
30 MS. CROSS: Annual Reports.

31
32 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Perry, you have something?

33
34 MR. MENDENHALL: It's been covered.

35
36 MS. CROSS: It's been covered already.

37
38 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. All right. Nominations
39 update, Tab W.

40
41 MS. CROSS: Last meeting we went through Annual
42 Reports.

43
44 MR. MENDENHALL: When we were at Unalakleet, we told
45 people in Unalakleet to make application if they want -- have
46 interest in this Board, you know, some of the people that
47 attended. And some of the current Board members [sic], like
48 Koyuk that has high impact Federal lands around it, we asked
49 for Frank Rose to put an application in, so I don't know
50 whether he'll meet that March 20th deadline.

00154

1 MS. CROSS: So Sheldon's.....

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: We don't know who.....

4

5 MS. CROSS:seat is up now. While we're up to
6 here, I hate to bring this up. We on nominations update, but
7 how many meetings has Joe Garnie missed without.....

8

9 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Without notice.

10

11 MS. CROSS: How many unexcused meetings does he have so
12 far, three?

13

14 MR. EDENSHAW: He hasn't contacted me. You know, we
15 sent out travel vouchers and stuff to him, since his first
16 meeting he attended in Nome.

17

18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Do we have any.....

19

20 MS. CROSS: In our regulations it says after three
21 meetings they're -- was it three meetings?

22

23 MR. EDENSHAW: That's been left up to the Council and
24 you can look in your Regional Council charter, it stipulates or
25 states unexcused absences, but that's been pretty much up to
26 the Council and the direction they want to go in regards to his
27 situation, or anyone else for that matter.

28

29 And to this date, nominations, we've had seven
30 applicants -- not seven, but three applicants from the Seward
31 Pen Region and those will fill -- Peter Buck has reapplied,
32 that's one of the seats that's up for reappointment. Fred
33 expressed to me, this is Fred's last meeting, he's not going to
34 reapply. And the other one is Sheldon, due to his resignation,
35 so there'll be three seats for reappointment.

36

37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: When do we do the nom -- applicants
38 or.....

39

40 MR. KATCHATAG: Can we add, what you call it now, we
41 should have an alternate for each position, you know.

42

43 MR. EDENSHAW: Well, I think at the last meeting, Fred,
44 a year ago they addressed alternates already and there was a
45 formal -- unless the Council -- they're free to change that.
46 And that's been recommended by another Council.

47

48 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Well, it's been my experience in
49 the village corporation, tribal council, that any time somebody
50 misses three meetings consecutively or three meetings they

00155

1 marked resigned or.....

2

3 MR. KATCHATAG: Do you have by-laws for this?

4

5 MR. EDENSHAW: It's inside your charter, Procedures
6 and.....

7

8 MS. CROSS: In our charter under S.

9

10 MR. KATCHATAG: Under S?

11

12 MS. CROSS: The very back page right before T. Removal
13 of Members

14

15 MR. EDENSHAW: It says, Removal of Members, yeah. My
16 experience with the other Council I work with, they sent
17 letters to individuals expressing their concern for unexcused
18 or they had made an attempt to contact the office in regards to
19 attending the meeting or not, so, you know. And that's just
20 something that's left up to the Council and however you wish to
21 proceed with that, that's.....

22

23 MS. CROSS: So the Chair has the -- or it's at his or
24 her discretion to recommend.....

25

26 MR. EDENSHAW: No. What would occur if the Council
27 wished to -- you know, if they sent a letter to Joe, expressing
28 concern of his absences and maybe you guys ask him if he's even
29 interested because he's attended the first meeting he went to
30 which you -- what is this your second year? So if he did that
31 and he expressed -- didn't express any interest or didn't
32 respond and you went to your next meeting, then you'd probably
33 do that. It's at the recommendation of the Council and Board
34 would take action on the Regional Council's recommendation,
35 yes.

36

37 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So could we then direct you to
38 write a letter to Joe Garnie and ask him if he wants to
39 continue to serve?

40

41 MR. EDENSHAW: That could be done, yes.

42

43 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, if he already missed two, that's
44 kind of automatic according to this.

45

46 MS. CROSS: It says the Chair of the Federal
47 Subsistence Board may recommend to the Secretary of the
48 Interior with concurrence of the Secretary to remove an
49 individual after missing to consecutive regular meetings. But
50 I think the action starts with some kind of notification to --

00156

1 it's unclear. It sounds like somebody needs to notify the
2 Chair of the Federal Subsistence Board this one member has been
3 gone three times. But how we're supposed to proceed in doing
4 -- what we choose to do -- right now we may want to choose to
5 write Joe Garnie a letter and say, are you still interested in
6 the Board? You have missed three meetings. You have three
7 unexcused absences that we are interested if you're still
8 interested in or should we recommend that somebody else be
9 appointed.

10
11 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, regardless of what -- I mean I
12 guess we got to notice -- I've only been on since this fall and
13 we had two meetings, I mean you know, with questionable
14 attendance and we did have lots of people from State and
15 Federal agencies attend the meetings to work with us on policy
16 decisions and make recommendations to the main Board. We can't
17 do our job if we have no quorum.

18
19 MS. CROSS: One absent member. Well, granted -- well,
20 that was one of the reasons why we didn't have a quorum is --
21 well, some people couldn't get there because of weather. We
22 knew why people couldn't get there, we didn't know why Joe
23 wasn't there. Nobody could contact -- I guess he was in some
24 sort of training for maybe Iditarod, I don't know, I never did
25 find out.

26
27 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: According to this paragraph, this
28 is the Chair of the Federal Subsistence, it doesn't say Chair
29 of the Subsistence Advisory Council.

30
31 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair, it would be much better for
32 the -- you know, at least the -- in my interactions with some
33 of the other Councils it's much better for the Regional
34 Councils to police their own members and if it got to a
35 situation where they needed the assistance of the Board, it
36 would be much better that way than to.....

37
38 MR. MENDENHALL: We're just going by what's written
39 here.

40
41 MR. EDENSHAW: Oh, no, I understand that. I'm trying
42 to explain to you that -- what action that's been taken in the
43 past and I suggested that if that's your -- if that's the wish
44 of the Council, I could draft a letter and I could set up
45 whatever the Council wish there to be regarding Joe's
46 situation, then you can make any changes you wish and.....

47
48 MS. CROSS: Are you talking about a letter to Joe
49 Garnie or letter to.....

50

00157

1 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes, to Joe Garnie.

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: With a cc to Mitch as well.

4

5 MS. CROSS: Yeah, because he may recommend -- he may
6 not. I mean I think we should take -- he's right.

7

8 MR. MENDENHALL: Have Mitch make -- he's aware of the
9 charter and make decision right there.

10

11 MS. CROSS: He's right, though, it's up to us to make
12 sure that our members are here to represent -- it's very
13 important. We need somebody that'll be active.

14

15 MR. KATCHATAG: We need somebody that's going to come.
16 I couldn't go to your meeting because I got hurt and I get off
17 and he's.....

18

19 MS. CROSS: Yeah, we knew that.

20

21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Well, with the concurrence of the
22 Council, I so direct Cliff to write a letter to Joe Garnie.

23

24 MS. CROSS: From the Chair of this.....

25

26 MR. MENDENHALL: And I think it'll be up to him to
27 contact agencies and IRAs and other groups to send nominations
28 before March 20th, which is, I think, has been done.

29

30 MS. CROSS: So do they give them a certain amount of
31 time, the other RACs, do they give them a certain amount to
32 respond to the letter? We need an answer before giving.....

33

34 MR. EDENSHAW: That would be conveyed in the letter to
35 Joe.

36

37 MS. CROSS: Okay. So a letter would be written, signed
38 by the Chair.....

39

40 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, I hate to make a break in my
41 routine, you know, come to a meeting and can't do anything
42 anyway, that doesn't work.

43

44 MS. CROSS: Well, I was getting concerned about it,
45 that's why I brought it up.

46

47 MR. MENDENHALL: Nobody wants it in May because it's
48 hunting season.

49

50 MR. BUCK: Can you hear me?

00158

1 MS. CROSS: We can hear you, Peter.

2

3 MR. BUCK: Yeah, speaking of the writing a letter, I
4 agree with that, but I also like have the Board's
5 reconsideration of the compensation that you get when you
6 attend meetings. I know you're getting \$150 when you're down
7 there and I know the compensation isn't enough for the Board
8 members and it's destroyed the morale, you know, and it's -- I
9 know when I leave my village I have to put some oil in my
10 stove, feed my family, make sure all the food is there and
11 everything and that compensation we get for attending meeting
12 isn't enough and I think we, as a Board, need to consider that,
13 too, when we think about writing a letter to Joe or anything
14 that goes on. I think that compensation needs to be brought up
15 again and again. We brought it up ever since I've been on the
16 Board and nothing has been done about it. So I'd like the
17 Board to consider, you know, finding a way to compensate the
18 Board members more adequately.

19

20 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Peter. I agree with
21 you, I think the money we get isn't very much, but it seems
22 like when we come to a meeting we kind fork up our monies to
23 come attend the meetings and -- which isn't very good, but
24 we're very committed and we're -- we want to see that this
25 thing works and that's why, I guess, that's why we're here. I
26 don't know how to address it, but I think the Council,
27 together, we could address that one.

28

29 Sue, you have something?

30

31 MS. DETWILER: Yes. The Board has written two letters
32 to the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture so far conveying
33 your concerns. They wrote the first letter last year and the
34 Council Chairs said that it wasn't written strongly enough to
35 convey the concerns of the Council members about getting
36 adequately compensated. So the Board wrote a second letter
37 that more strongly conveyed the concerns about being
38 compensated and that was sent to the Secretaries and we haven't
39 heard back yet, but we expect to hear anytime now what the
40 decision back there is going to be.

41

42 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Anything else you need to add,
43 Cliff?

44

45 MR. EDENSHAW: No. Once I've prepared the letter I'll
46 fax copies to those of you who have fax numbers for review of
47 the letter, specifically the Chair, yes, but I'll send it to
48 the others for further review also.

49

50 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you, Sue. Thank you, Cliff.

00159

1 MS. CROSS: And this will be before our spring meeting?

2
3 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes, it will.

4
5 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Place of our next Regional Council
6 meeting.

7
8 MS. CROSS: Can I make a.....

9
10 MR. EDENSHAW: Just -- excuse me.

11
12 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: All right, go ahead.

13
14 MR. EDENSHAW: Just a few comments here. You guys when
15 you make your decision regarding the meeting, I put an updated
16 calendar. On September 9th and 10th, North Slope is meeting in
17 Barrow. Helen and Donna work with that team (sic). The
18 following week on the 15th, 16th and 17th, the Kodiak
19 Aleutians, I cover that region. And the following week, Helen
20 and Donna will be with the Northwest up in the Kotzebue region,
21 so those three weeks right there, you know, have to toss out
22 the window and go from there.

23
24 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: The first week of May?

25
26 MR. EDENSHAW: No, no, this is in September. This is
27 for.....

28
29 MS. ARMSTRONG: Tab XYZ.

30
31 MR. EDENSHAW: No, I gave you guys handouts. These
32 were new.....

33
34 MS. ARMSTRONG: (Indiscernible - away from microphone)

35
36 MR. EDENSHAW: I gave them new handouts with a new
37 calendar.

38
39 MS. CROSS: September 6th through 26th is not available
40 to us because key official people are somewhere else. We might
41 as well cross that out. So we have from the 27th to October --
42 the window closes the 23rd.

43
44 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any ideas, suggestions from the
45 Council?

46
47 MR. KATCHATAG: October would be the best I think, we
48 can't in September. You see this is -- up here in Alaska the
49 livelihood is real hard and when you meet in a village like
50 last year when we meet in Nome, Grace didn't get not a penny.

00160

1 This is not right, you can't -- this business of voluntary is
2 no more, people don't volunteer no more. And anytime you go to
3 the meeting and not getting paid.....

4
5 (Indiscernible - multiple voices discussing dates)

6
7 MS. CROSS: October 15.

8
9 MR. EDENSHAW: Well, actually the 15th was.....

10
11 MS. CROSS: It seems to me that we were kind of looking
12 for September 27 through October 10th.

13
14 MR. KATCHATAG: How about October 1st.....

15
16 MS. CROSS: No, I mean somewhere between these dates.

17
18 MR. MENDENHALL: How about 25, 26th, 27th?

19
20 MS. CROSS: Donna and Helen are not available.

21
22 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, but see the.....

23
24 MS. CROSS: Helen and Donna are going to be gone during
25 the entire of September 20th through the 26th?

26
27 MR. MENDENHALL: The whole week.

28
29 MS. ARMSTRONG: No, we won't be gone all week. We'll
30 be -- the meeting will be the 22nd and 23rd. We'll probably
31 leave on the 21st and return -- we'll be in Kotzebue, we could
32 stop (indiscernible - away from microphone) on our way back.

33
34 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: How about 24, 25 and 26?

35
36 MS. CROSS: 24, 25, 26?

37
38 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay, arrive 24, meet on 25, Friday
39 and go back on Saturday.

40
41 MS. CROSS: You mean have the meeting on 25 and 26?

42
43 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yeah.

44
45 MS. CROSS: That would probably cheaper for them, too.

46
47 MR. EDENSHAW: And since I'm volunteering, I'd like to
48 do on the weekend.

49
50 MR. MENDENHALL: That's just what I'm trying to do.

00161

1 MS. ARMSTRONG: Sometimes it's travel is hard -- one
2 reason we've avoided traveling on the weekends is because some
3 villages, and I don't know if this is true in the Seward
4 Peninsula but sometimes people can't travel on Saturday or
5 Sunday, the planes don't fly. So I don't know if that would
6 apply to your villages or not.

7
8 MS. CROSS: So we're actually talking about Sunday and
9 Saturday.

10
11 MR. MENDENHALL: Most villages in the area are -- we
12 have weekend travel.

13
14 MS. CROSS: All of the villages do.

15
16 MR. MENDENHALL: Just Kotzebue that's up there, they
17 don't.

18
19 MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, on the North Slope they don't
20 have weekend travel to the villages.

21
22 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: So 24, 25 and 26.

23
24 MR. MENDENHALL: (Indiscernible - lowers voice)

25
26 MS. CROSS: It's like a two day meeting, right?

27
28 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yeah, two day.

29
30 MS. CROSS: Board members start traveling on the 23rd,
31 we'd have the meeting on the 24th and 25th.

32
33 MR. MENDENHALL: 25th, 26th?

34
35 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: 25th, 26th.

36
37 MR. MENDENHALL: 25th, 26th.

38
39 MS. CROSS: I was just trying to -- there's no way for
40 Donna and Helen to come directly to Nome anyway, they'd have to
41 go through Anchorage to get back here. What do you think 25th
42 and 26th of.....

43
44 MR. MENDENHALL: They got a direct Baker flight.

45
46 MS. CROSS: Only on Mondays.

47
48 MR. MENDENHALL: That's Cape Smythe.

49
50 MS. CROSS: Cape Smythe's an unscheduled. I traveled

00162

1 there, it's a hard.....

2

3 MR. MENDENHALL: Alaska Airlines will probably still
4 have flights then because they never really close off.

5

6 MS. CROSS: So everybody's preference is 24th, 25th and
7 26th, is what we're saying?

8

9 MR. MENDENHALL: That'll give them a breather on the
10 24th.

11

12 MR. EDENSHAW: That's Friday and Saturday then?

13

14 MR. MENDENHALL: Friday, Saturday, you got a one day
15 breather.....

16

17 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay, the 24th through the 26th. Where
18 at?

19

20 MR. MENDENHALL: Will you still be breathing?

21

22 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I think everybody agreed to Nome.

23

24 MS. CROSS: Nome.

25

26 MR. MENDENHALL: Um-hum.

27

28 MS. CROSS: We promise not to take you to Teller.

29

30 MS. ARMSTRONG: Is this going to be two day meeting?

31

32 MS. CROSS: Pardon?

33

34 MS. ARMSTRONG: Is this going to be two day meeting?

35

36 MS. CROSS: We don't know what's on the agenda, does it
37 normally run about three days?

38

39 MR. MENDENHALL: See, right now, if we do it that way,
40 we still got this.....

41

42 MS. CROSS: Well, just in case -- you don't know what's
43 going to happen between now and then. We'll slot two days, if
44 you get done on the 25th, fine, everybody can go home. And
45 it's not going to make the village travel any cheaper.

46

47 MS. ARMSTRONG: No, right.

48

49 MS. CROSS: It's still going to be the same price for
50 them come and they exchange the reservations. It's just going

00163

1 to make a difference in what kind of tickets you buy, but it's
2 only \$35 change fee and you're still not paying for the full
3 fare.

4
5 MR. MENDENHALL: If you take advantage of a village
6 corporation, Sitnasuak or Bering Straits, they got these three
7 bedroom apartments that are there and they could be at lower
8 costs than a regular hotel.

9
10 MS. ARMSTRONG: If they're available, last time there
11 -- none of that was available to us.

12
13 MR. MENDENHALL: In September?

14
15 MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

16
17 MR. MENDENHALL: There was none?

18
19 MS. ARMSTRONG: It was (indiscernible - away from
20 microphone)

21
22 MS. CROSS: Well, which means that somebody has to make
23 reservations, like, today.

24
25 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah, because it'll start booking.

26
27 MS. CROSS: Right today.

28
29 MR. MENDENHALL: Like in Nome right now, you got to
30 book a year ahead in advance for Iditarod.

31
32 MS. CROSS: What do you think, Peter Buck?

33
34 MR. BUCK: I think it's (phone fade out) I'm not
35 worried about September yet, so it will be a good time.

36
37 MS. CROSS: Okay, Peter Buck, we'll make decision for
38 you, you can't go moose hunting then.

39
40 MR. BUCK: I'm not that far ahead, I don't care what
41 they (phone fade) good for me.

42
43 MS. CROSS: Okay. See you in Nome then.

44
45 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Any comments from the Council
46 before we adjourn.

47
48 MR. KATCHATAG: Start from the Chair, start from the
49 Chair.

50

00164

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Yes. I thank you all for your vote
2 of confidence, I'll do my best to serve. It's sort of a
3 learning experience for me. Even though I sit in on -- chaired
4 several different organizations, but one thing I learn is when
5 somebody make a motion, I was eager to get the vote, so I'm a
6 little more cautious now, I'm going to be a little more patient
7 and I thank you all for making it over and I feel a little sad
8 that some of you can't make it, I know we're all committed to
9 the same goal and that is to make our life a little easier,
10 work some other ways to get along and I have a -- you are very
11 wonderful people, all of you, and I thank the staff and our
12 coordinator and Mr. Recorder for being patient with us.

13
14 Grace, any comment?

15
16 MS. CROSS: We'll see you in Nome.

17
18 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Perry.

19
20 MR. MENDENHALL: Well, thanks for the vote of
21 confidence, too, for Vice Chair and I'll try to uphold that.
22 And I'll help as much as I can to keep parliamentary rules and
23 anything else regarding the resolutions in that manner. And
24 I'll participate in as much as I can in other subsistence
25 matters and other agencies, so contribute this into this --
26 along with those new knowledge experiences. And being on this
27 Federal Board is a new experience, it's a lot different. I
28 think we need to -- when we make village travel an issue too,
29 because I think we need to get into the villages that are being
30 served and I was sort of looking toward Shishmaref or someplace
31 like that, too, for next meeting, but you guys already chose
32 Nome. And I think we need to try to hold village meetings as
33 much as possible.

34
35 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Mr. Eningowuk.

36
37 MR. ENINGOWUK: Thank the rest of the Board members and
38 staff for allowing me to attend my first meeting here and I'm
39 really not new to subsistence, being -- having worked with the
40 region and also in coastal management, I'm very familiar with
41 our lifestyle and how we hope to improve that lifestyle. I
42 would like to thank you for your vote of confidence for trying
43 to make me Chair and I thank you for your vote, but I think
44 we'll survive, we'll work together and no matter who's the
45 Chair, I think we'll -- as long as we work together we'll
46 always get things done. I believe strongly in that, that we
47 each bring something forth.

48
49 Thank you.

50

00165

1 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you. Mr. Katchatag.

2

3 MR. KATCHATAG: I think we're learning to work
4 together, I hope. I have more confidence in the staff now than
5 I used to. And if you keep this up, boy, you might be directed
6 again next year. And I'll make the last move, we adjourn.

7

8 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: I'd like to get Peter's comment.
9 You have a comment, Peter?

10

11 MR. BUCK: Yeah, I just -- I'm sorry I didn't have my
12 reading material handy but I've been stuck out here for two
13 days, but I think the meeting was pretty informative. I'll see
14 you in September. I'm just going to go out and meet Joe
15 Garnie, he called me from Koyuk.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 MR. BUCK: And we'll see you in September.

20

21 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Okay. Thank you. There was a
22 motion by Mr. Fred Katchatag to adjourn. Is there a second?

23

24 MS. CROSS: Second.

25

26 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Seconded by Grace. Call for
27 question.

28

29 MR. ENINGOWUK: Question.

30

31 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Question's been called. All in
32 favor say aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 CHAIRMAN KATCHEAK: Thank you and good evening.

37

38 (Off record - 4:46 p.m.)

39

40 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

41

42

* * * * *

00166

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter and Owner of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 49 through 165 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Seward Peninsula Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, Volume II, meeting taken electronically by David W. Haynes on the 17th day of March, 1998, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at the Hampton Inn, Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by Mary E. Miller and Joseph P. Kolasinski to the best of their knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 30th day of March, 1998.

JOSEPH P. KOLASINSKI
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 04/17/00